

By What Authority?

Companion C — The Apostolikon Antitheses

Marcion's lost Antitheses reconstructed from the interpolation-stripped Pauline corpus.

By What Authority? – The Apostolikon Antitheses

First public edition, May 2026.

This edition is complete as published; no ongoing update schedule is planned.

© Chrestos, 2026

Released under the Creative Commons

Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International licence (CC BY-SA 4.0).

Free to share, translate, adapt, and redistribute, including commercially,
provided attribution is given, changes are indicated, and adaptations are shared alike.

Full terms: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Canonical edition notice: this is the Chrestos edition of the series.

Adaptations are permitted, but modified versions must identify their changes
and must not be presented as the Chrestos edition or the author's reconstruction
unless released by Chrestos. Silent alteration of reconstructed text or argument
blurs the distinction this series exists to preserve.

Cite as: *By What Authority* series, Chrestos (2026).

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.20085840](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20085840)

Dataset and analysis workbench:

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-pauline-analysis-zip

No institution. No publisher. Freely shared.

IN THIS SERIES

Volume 1 — The Argument in Brief

The complete case in one sitting. All the core claims; the evidence condensed.

Volume 2 — How Paul's Letters Were Edited

The full forty-nine-chapter argument: textual evidence, patristic timeline, gospel analysis, and the strongest objections answered.

Volume 3 — The Chain from Scripture to Sovereignty

The institutional and legal consequence: from the editorial programme to the Doctrine of Discovery, the oath architecture, and the question the system cannot answer.

Companion A — The Verse-by-Verse Analysis

The complete adjudication record: signal codes, confidence scores, and manuscript evidence for every assessed passage. Designed for scholarly consultation.

Companion B — The Reconstructed Pauline Letters

The ten Pauline letters with the identified interpolations removed. A clean reading text. Use alongside Companion A for the evidence behind each excision.

Companion C — The Apostolikon Antitheses

Marcion's lost Antitheses reconstructed from the interpolation-stripped Pauline corpus. Each entry places an Old Testament passage alongside its Apostolikon counterpart.

Full series: archive.org/details/by-what-authority-full-series

All volumes freely shared.

Verse-by-verse analysis dataset and workbench: archive.org/details/by-what-authority-pauline-analysis-zip

SHORT READINGS

Standalone introductory documents — each addresses the argument from a specific starting point.

The Argument in Twenty Minutes — a self-contained introduction: the full case from the felt tension to the Doctrine of Discovery, no prior reading required

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-argument-twenty-minutes
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465037

For People Drawn to Christianity — those who sense something real but cannot accept parts of what the tradition became

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-people-drawn-to-christianity
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465039

For People Who Left the Church — those who walked away and wonder whether they left the right thing

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-people-who-left-the-church
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465043

For Lawyers — those who work with authority and want to know where it comes from

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-lawyers
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465046

For Those Concerned with Indigenous Sovereignty — those who want to understand the documentary root of the colonial claim

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-indigenous-sovereignty
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465050

For People Who Have No Religion — those who assume Paul has nothing to say to them

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-secular-readers
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465052

For Military Personnel and Oath-Takers — those who have sworn allegiance and want to know what they swore to

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-for-military-oath-takers
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21465055

The Unfinished Reformation — a short companion to the series: what the Reformation recovered from Marcion's instinct without knowing it, and what it left standing

archive.org/details/by-what-authority-the-unfinished-reformation
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21446467

Contents

Introduction: The Lost Antitheses	6
Part I – The Attested Antitheses	10
Part II – Derived Antitheses: The Apostolikon Against the Old Testament	20
The Law: Blessing or Curse?	22
Circumcision: Covenant Sign or Nullity?	36
The Character of God: Wrath, Jealousy, and Terror	41
Ethnic Election and the Universal Gospel	48
Slavery and Hierarchy: The Absent Haustafel	54
Creation, “This Present Evil Age”, and the Hidden God	60
Wisdom and the Rulers	72
Dietary Law, Sabbath, and Purity Codes	79
The Sacrificial System and Grace	85
The Absent Passages: What the Editors Were Answering	91
Conclusion: What the Antitheses Reveal	96

Introduction: The Lost Antitheses

Marcion of Sinope (c. 85–160 CE) prefaced his collection of Paul’s letters — the Apostolikon — with a book he called the Antitheses. It is entirely lost. What survives is a series of paraphrases and counter-quotations embedded in hostile polemic: Tertullian’s five-volume *Adversus Marcionem* (c. 207 CE), Epiphanius’s Panarion 42 (c. 374 CE), and the scholarly reconstruction by Adolf von Harnack in *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (1921). These sources agree that the Antitheses set passages from Paul’s letters alongside passages from the Old Testament, pressing the contradiction between them to argue that the God Paul proclaimed was not the God of the Hebrew Bible. The present companion is a reconstruction of that exercise using Companion B — the Pauline corpus reconstructed without later interpolations — as its base text.

What Survives

Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* Books I–IV engage Marcion’s theology directly; Book V works letter by letter through the Apostolikon. Epiphanius’s Panarion 42 lists passages Marcion accepted and rejected from each letter, with brief theological notes. Harnack assembled thirty numbered antitheses from these sources, together with several additional ones attested only in Tertullian’s Book V commentary. The following three examples illustrate the character of the attested antitheses:

Deut 21:23

his body shall not remain all night on the tree, but you shall surely bury him the same day; for he who is hanged is accursed of God.

Gal 3:13

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us. For it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree,’

Exod 20:8–11

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. You shall labor six days, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to Yahweh your God... for in six days Yahweh made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; therefore Yahweh blessed the Sabbath day, and made it holy.

Col 2:16–17

Let no one therefore judge you in eating, or in drinking, or with respect to a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath day, which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's.

Exod 34:29–35

It happened, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tablets of the covenant in Moses' hand... Moses didn't know that the skin of his face shone... the children of Israel were afraid to come near him... He put a veil on his face... but when Moses went in before Yahweh to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out.

2 Cor 3:6–14

who also made us sufficient as servants of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the Spirit. For the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. But if the service of death, written engraved on stones, came with glory... won't service of the Spirit be with much more glory?... and not as Moses, who put a veil on his face, that the children of Israel wouldn't look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away. But their minds were hardened, for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remains, because in Christ it passes away.

Why Companion B Changes the Exercise

The passages absent from Companion B include the Abraham-faith chain (Gal 3:6–9), the circumcision/Abraham argument (Romans 4), the Israel election architecture (Romans 9–11), the Haustafel (Col 3:18–4:1), and the governing-authorities passage (Romans 13:1–7). These are precisely the passages that later editors inserted into canonical Paul to harmonise the Apostolikon with the Old Testament. Their exclusion from Companion B was not made to sharpen antitheses. The interpolations were identified on independent evidential grounds before their common effect was observed.

Across the ten letters of the Apostolikon, 153 documented antithesis pairs emerge from this base text — roughly one for every ten verses of the reconstructed corpus. That figure deserves to be held for a moment.

One hundred and fifty-three directed contradictions, distributed across ten independent letters, spanning thirteen distinct theological domains — law, circumcision, divine identity, election, purity, cosmos, wisdom, sacrifice — do not arise from selective reading. A text assembled by random Pauline citation would not produce this signature. A text whose author was consistently framing the God of Christ against the Creator of Israel produces exactly this signature, and does so across every letter in the collection.

The more significant fact is structural. The passages independently identified as later interpolations in Companion A — identified on source-critical grounds before their effect on antithesis density was considered — are precisely the passages that, if

retained, would reduce that density. Romans 13:1–7 supplies a governing-authorities theology compatible with OT statecraft. Romans 4 builds an Abraham-faith bridge between the Hebrew covenant and Pauline gospel. Romans 9–11 provides an election-continuity architecture that dissolves the replacement question. Galatians 3:15–25 introduces a developmental account of the law that softens the curse-and-freedom binary Paul otherwise uses. Each interpolation does theological work against an antithesis. Their identification by independent criteria and their harmonising function against the antithesis catalogue are not the same observation. That these two findings converge is itself evidence that the interpolations were intentional and that the shorter text is earlier.

The antitheses were always there. Removing the harmonising additions does not create contradictions. It restores the ones the additions were written to resolve. The interpolations collected in Companion A were identified on independent evidential grounds: Marcionite absence (patristic attestation of the verse being absent from Marcion's Apostolikon), structural rupture (argument coherence breaks at the interpolated point), and stylistic anomaly. Their common effect — harmonising Paul with the Old Testament — was a finding that emerged from that independent identification. It was not the criterion used to identify them. The antitheses in this companion are what remains after that independent process. They were not constructed by selecting OT-contradicting passages. They are the corpus with the later OT-harmonising insertions set aside, reflecting the proto-Pauline text Marcion received. The evidence for those insertions is in Companion A.

How to Read the Entries

Each antithesis entry uses a two-block layout. The top block (lighter shading, italicised) contains the Old Testament passage with its reference in the upper right. The bottom block (darker shading) contains the Apostolikon passage with its reference. An analytical note below each pair addresses the specific claim being contradicted, whether later interpolations absent from Companion B would have softened the antithesis, and where secondary scholarship is relevant. The World English Bible (WEB) translation is used throughout for both sides.

Interpolation entries (Chapter 13) display the same two-block structure, with the bottom block showing the canonical text of the later-inserted passage in a warm red tint and marked with the REM flag. The note below each entry explains what Old Testament tension that insertion was resolving, and what that tension looks like without it — that is, in the proto-Pauline text Marcion received. For the full adjudication record, see Companion A.

A Note on Method

Paul wrote to specific communities facing specific problems. A reader can argue that his anti-law statements were addressed to Galatian communities being pressured toward circumcision, not intended as universal theological claims. This companion does not dismiss that objection. What it records is the consistent pattern: the same

anti-law, anti-institutional-hierarchy, anti-ethnic-election argument runs through letters addressed to Rome (a community Paul had never visited, writing as a general theological statement), Galatia, Philippi, and Colossae. A situational explanation accounts for one letter. It does not account for a corpus-wide pattern that runs in the same direction across every letter where the relevant topics arise.

Companion C does not argue that the interpolations should be removed. That case is in Volumes 1 and 2 of this series and in the evidence record of Companion A. This companion shows the theological consequences of accepting that case. A reader who disputes the interpolation evidence should engage Companion A first. A reader who accepts it will find in Companion C what the reconstructed text actually says when set against the sources it is most often harmonised with.

A Note on Scope

Companion C covers the Apostolikon against the Old Testament only. Paul's authentic letters predate the canonical Gospels, Acts, and the other NT letters by ten to forty years; symmetric theological comparison with those documents is a different project. The concluding chapter notes two NT source-critical observations — on Acts and on 1 Peter — as observations rather than antithesis entries, since the chronological relationship between those documents and Paul is not symmetric.

The most common response to the contrast between the OT God and Paul's God is the fulfilment argument: Jesus fulfilled the law, so the old covenant gives way to the new. This is a Gospel claim — drawn primarily from Matthew 5:17, written decades after Paul. It does not engage the Apostolikon. Paul does not argue that Christ fulfilled the law and thereby replaced it. He argues that the law was a curse from which Christ redeemed us (Gal 3:13), that the law was never the vehicle of the promise (Gal 3:14, retained), and that what remains without the developmental scaffolding later editors inserted at Gal 3:15–25 is a stark before-and-after: curse, then freedom, with no account of why the curse-giving God was the same as the freedom-giving one. Fulfilment theology softens the break; Paul's own language in Companion B does not. The fulfilment argument addresses a later harmonisation, not the Apostolikon text this companion works from.

Part I – The Attested Antitheses

The following entries are historically documented: Tertullian, Epiphanius, or Harnack's reconstruction explicitly records Marcion's use of the OT-Apostolikon contrast in each case. These are not inferences from the text. They are attested arguments, preserved in hostile paraphrases and counter-quotations from authors who were arguing against Marcion but who, in the act of refuting him, preserved the substance of what he actually said.

The Tertullian reference for each entry is drawn from *Adversus Marcionem* (c. 207 CE). The Epiphanius references are from *Panarion* 42 (c. 374 CE). Harnack's reconstruction refers to *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (1921). All three wrote to refute Marcion; their testimony is hostile-witness evidence of the strongest kind: they had every reason not to preserve material that supported his position, and they preserved it anyway.

Deut 21:23

his body shall not remain all night on the tree, but you shall surely bury him the same day; for he who is hanged is accursed of God.

Gal 3:13

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us. For it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree,'

Source: Marc. V.3; also Marc. III.18; Panarion 42.8.1–3; Panarion 42.11.15f. (footnote \#125, citing Gal 3:13 and 4:23, cross-ref Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.3.10). The Creator's own law (Deut 21:23) pronounces a divine curse on everyone who hangs on a tree; the mode of crucifixion is therefore explicitly cursed by the Demiurge. Paul then claims this crucified Christ "redeemed us from the curse of the law" by becoming that curse. Marcion's antithesis presses: if the Creator cursed hanging on a tree, and Christ died exactly that death, then either the Creator's Christ has been destroyed by his own law or — Marcion's preferred reading — Christ belongs to the good God, who entered alien (Creator-ruled) territory and allowed the curse to fall precisely because he was alien to the Creator's dispensation. Epiphanius (Panarion 42.8.1–3) quotes Marcion: "If we were his, he would not 'buy' what was his own. He entered someone else's world as a 'buyer' to redeem us." In Companion B, Gal 3:6–9 and Gal 3:15–21 (except 3:22) are absent because they were not in the proto-Pauline text Marcion received — later editors inserted them into canonical Paul — so 3:10–14 stands as an unmediated law-curse / faith-blessing binary without the surrounding typological scaffolding.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare that everyone who hangs on a tree is accursed by God and also be the one whose Christ was deliberately hanged to redeem humanity from that curse. If the Creator cursed the hanged, then either the crucifixion fell under that curse — meaning Christ was destroyed by his own Father's law — or the crucified Christ does not belong to the Creator. The text does not resolve this tension. Marcion's reading does.

Deut 27:26

Cursed is everyone who doesn't continue in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them." Also Hab 2:4 (quoted in Gal 3:11) — "The righteous shall live by his faith.

Gal 3:10–12

For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse. For it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who doesn't continue in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them.' Now that no man is justified by the law before God is evident, for, 'The righteous will live by faith.' The law is not of faith, but, 'The man who does them will live by them.'

Source: Marc. V.3; Panarion 42.11.15f. (footnote #124, citing the combined curse-of-law / righteous-by-faith passage). Harnack identifies this as antithesis (xx), the most programmatic statement of the Antitheses' central polarity: law = curse, gospel/faith = blessing. Paul himself supplies the OT evidence for both poles — Deut 27:26 for the law-curse, Hab 2:4 for faith-life. Marcion takes this as decisive proof that the two economies issue from two different deities: the one who demands complete law-observance on pain of curse is not the same as the one who gives life to those who believe. Tertullian (Marc. V.3) rebukes this by noting that the same Creator "set before you a blessing and a curse" (Deut 30:19): diversity within one deity is not evidence of two. In Companion B, Gal 3:6–9 and 3:15–21 are absent from the text Marcion received — later editors inserted them into canonical Paul — leaving 3:10–14 as a stark binary: the law pronounces universal curse; faith gives life. The Abraham material later inserted into canonical Paul is the very context in which canonical Paul grounds faith-righteousness in the Creator's own promises — its absence from the proto-Pauline text makes the antithesis structurally sharper.

Contradiction: The same God cannot be the source of a system where pursuing the law brings blessing and also the source of the declaration that pursuing the law places you already under a curse. Paul himself quotes the OT to establish both the curse and the faith-alternative — which means the same text is being used to support opposite conclusions about what law-pursuit produces. The deity who demanded total law-observance under pain of curse is not the same one who says the law is not of faith and gives life by a completely different mechanism.

Lam 3:12

He has bent his bow, and set me as a mark for the arrow." Also Deut 32:23 — "I will heap evils on them. I will spend my arrows on them.

Eph 6:11, 16

Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil... above all, taking up the shield of faith, with which you will be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one.

Source: Marc. V.18; Panarion 42.11.15f. (Eph passages generally retained by Marcion). The antithesis contrasts the Creator-God who deploys literal bows and arrows against Israel (Lam 3:12; Deut 32:23; Ps 7:13) with Paul's apostolic call to spiritual armament against "the wiles of the devil." Marcion reads this as Paul teaching that the real adversary to be resisted

is the Demiurge's hostile, martial world-order, overcome not by counter-violence but by spiritual equipment belonging to a different economy entirely. Tertullian (Marc. V.18) acknowledges the "spiritual armour and warfare" Paul describes but reads it as consistent with the Creator. In Companion B, Eph 5:22–6:9 (the household code) is absent — the file jumps from 5:21 directly to 6:10 — so the armor-of-God passage follows immediately after the community exhortations, making combat against principalities more prominently the letter's final practical move rather than embedded in domestic hierarchy instructions.

Contradiction: The same God cannot be the one shooting arrows at his people and also the one whose apostle instructs believers to arm themselves against the fiery darts of the evil one. In the OT God is the archer; in Paul, God's people are armed against an archer. If these are the same God, believers are being told to raise the shield of faith against their own deity's weapons.

Exod 20:8–11

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. You shall labor six days, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to Yahweh your God... for in six days Yahweh made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; therefore Yahweh blessed the Sabbath day, and made it holy.

Col 2:16–17

Let no one therefore judge you in eating, or in drinking, or with respect to a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath day, which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's.

Source: Marc. V.19; Panarion 42.11.15f. (passage 1(39) = Col 2:16–17, footnote \#122, cross-ref Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.19.9). The Creator's fourth commandment legislates the Sabbath as a perpetual holy ordinance anchored to the creation narrative. Paul declares it merely "a shadow of the things to come," with the substance belonging to Christ. Marcion takes this as Paul explicitly cancelling the Creator's sacred time — along with feast days, new moons, and dietary regulations — because these shadow-observances belong to the lower deity's economy. Tertullian (Marc. V.19) responds that "the shadow, therefore, is His to whom belongs the body also; in other words, the law is His, and so is Christ." In Companion B, Col 2:14–17 form a tight uninterrupted unit — handwriting cancelled (2:14), principalities stripped (2:15), food and Sabbath declared shadow (2:16–17) — making the anti-OT-law sequence especially compact.

Contradiction: The same God cannot bless and sanctify the Sabbath as a memorial of his own creative act — "therefore Yahweh blessed the Sabbath day, and made it holy" — and also be the source of a declaration that the Sabbath is merely a shadow with no present normative force. What the Creator hallowed in his own nature and inscribed as the fourth commandment cannot become optional without the Creator's character and authority having fundamentally changed.

Exod 34:29–35

It happened, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tablets of the covenant in Moses' hand... Moses didn't know that the skin of his face shone... the

children of Israel were afraid to come near him... He put a veil on his face... but when Moses went in before Yahweh to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out.

2 Cor 3:6–14

who also made us sufficient as servants of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the Spirit. For the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. But if the service of death, written engraved on stones, came with glory... won't service of the Spirit be with much more glory?... and not as Moses, who put a veil on his face, that the children of Israel wouldn't look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away. But their minds were hardened, for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remains, because in Christ it passes away.

Source: Marc. V.11; Panarion 42.11.15f. (2 Corinthians passages present in the Apostolikon as Marcion received it). Paul names the Mosaic covenant explicitly as “the service of death, written engraved on stones” and the old covenant dispensation as one of hardened minds covered by a veil. Marcion uses this passage to argue that the Creator's covenant is intrinsically death-dealing: the letter kills, the law is administered with fading glory, and the minds of those under it remain blinded. The OT scene of Moses veiling himself (Exod 34) is repurposed as a figure for the Creator's economy being designed to conceal rather than reveal. Tertullian (Marc. V.11) argues that both “killing in the letter” and “quickening in the Spirit” belong to the Creator who himself said “I kill and I make alive.” In Companion B, 2 Corinthians survives nearly intact (only 6:14–7:1 absent — a later insertion not in the proto-Pauline text); the letter/spirit antithesis in chapter 3 is the theological centrepiece of the letter as reconstructed.

Contradiction: The same God cannot give a covenant at Sinai that made Moses' face radiant with glory and also be the source of a description of that same covenant as “the service of death” and “the service of condemnation.” The Sinai encounter is the high-point of the OT's God revealing himself to his people. Paul calls the ministry issuing from it a ministry of death. A God who genuinely gave life at Sinai cannot also be the one who calls that giving death-dealing.

Lev 11:44–45; Exod 12:43–49; Num 15:38–40

The “law of commandments contained in ordinances” encompasses the Mosaic legislative code as a whole: the purity statutes, the Passover exclusion of foreigners, and the fringe-law markers — legislation that kept Gentiles permanently alien to Israel's covenant.

Eph 2:14–15

For he is our peace, who made both one, and broke down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the hostility, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man of the two, making peace;

Source: Marc. V.17; Panarion 42.11.15f. (passage 1(36) = Eph 2:11–14, footnote #119, cross-ref Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.17.12). Paul describes the “middle wall of partition” — enforced by the Mosaic law-code — as something Christ abolished “in his flesh.” Marcion reads “the hostility” (τὴν ἔχθραν) as the law itself, which Christ came to destroy: the Creator's

ordinances are an active enmity that the good God's Christ cancels. The OT legislation permanently excluded Gentiles from Israel's covenant-life; this permanent exclusion is exactly what Paul says Christ "broke down." Tertullian (Marc. V.17) argues that making the law "obsolete" by fulfilling it is not the same as attributing it to a hostile deity. In Companion B, Eph 2:12 carries a SUS flag — the explicit statement that Gentiles were "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel" is consistent with a later canonical addition that contextualizes the "middle wall" within OT covenant categories. On the series' thesis, Marcion received a proto-Pauline text to which 2:12 had not yet been added; the verse grounds the antithesis in Israel's covenant-history in a way that canonically situates it, but without it the "middle wall" appears as a purely theological barrier with no OT covenant-historical frame, making the antithesis structurally sharper.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate a permanent legal barrier between Jews and Gentiles — enforced by the whole Mosaic code — and also be the one who sent Christ to abolish that law "in his flesh." Paul calls the law itself the "hostility" that the cross destroyed. If God built the wall through his own law, he cannot also have sent Christ to demolish it without being in direct contradiction with himself.

Gen 17:10–12

This is my covenant, which you shall keep, between me and you and your offspring after you. Every male among you shall be circumcised... and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you.

Phil 3:4–9

though I myself might have confidence even in the flesh... circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; concerning the law, a Pharisee... concerning the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless. However, I consider those things that were gain to me as a loss for Christ... and count them nothing but refuse, that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith;

Source: Marc. V.20; the chapter heading explicitly states: "NO ANTITHESIS (SUCH AS MARCION ALLEGED) IN THE GOD OF JUDAISM AND THE GOD OF THE GOSPEL DEDUCIBLE FROM CERTAIN CONTRASTS MENTIONED IN THIS EPISTLE." Paul systematically lists impeccable OT credentials — circumcision on the eighth day, Benjaminite lineage, Pharisaic law-observance, blamelessness before the law — then calls them all σκόβαλα (refuse, dung) compared to knowing Christ. The "righteousness which is of the law" stands in direct contrast to "the righteousness which is from God by faith." Marcion uses this as Paul himself explicitly rejecting the Creator's entire covenantal framework as worthless: the OT's highest marker of covenant-membership and its model of righteousness are valued at zero compared to Christ. Tertullian (Marc. V.20) concedes the contrast but argues Paul "repudiates not the God of the Jews, but their stupid obduracy." In Companion B, Philippians survives entirely without any verses identified as later insertions — it is the control text for the disputed letters; the law/faith contrast in chapter 3 is fully present.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish circumcision as his eternal covenant sign — "it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you" — and also be the source of a

declaration that the highest expression of that covenant-membership is refuse and dung compared to knowing Christ. Either the covenant sign has genuine worth before God or it is worthless. The same deity cannot coherently command both.

The "handwriting in ordinances" (χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν) refers to the legal statutes of Mosaic law as a debt-document against humanity; compare Ezek 20:18–20
I said to their children in the wilderness, 'Don't walk in the statutes of your fathers... walk in my statutes, and keep my ordinances... Keep my Sabbaths holy; and they shall be a sign between me and you.'

Col 2:14

wiping out the handwriting in ordinances which was against us; and he has taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross;

Source: Marc. V.19 (in the same section as A-4 above). Paul describes the Creator's legal code as a "handwriting against us" — a hostile document — that Christ's cross has cancelled. The word χειρόγραφον (handwriting / certificate of debt) implies the law was a hostile document binding humanity under obligation to the Creator. Marcion reads this as the cross literally abolishing the Creator's law: nailed to the cross means destroyed, not fulfilled. The antithesis is sharpened when set against Ezek 20:18–20, where the Creator commands the very statutes and Sabbaths that Col 2:14–17 then dismisses. In Companion B, Col 2:11–17 form an unbroken sequence of anti-law images: circumcision-not-of-hands (2:11), burial/resurrection past legal obligation (2:12–13), handwriting cancelled (2:14), principalities stripped (2:15), food and Sabbath declared shadow (2:16–17).

Contradiction: The same God cannot issue his commandments as binding holy statutes and also allow those commandments to be described as a hostile certificate of debt against humanity, nailed to the cross and cancelled. A God who genuinely meant his law cannot also have it described as "against us." The only coherent reading is that the law being destroyed belonged to a different authority than the one behind the cross.

Gen 21:10

Therefore she said to Abraham, 'Cast out this servant and her son, for the son of this servant will not be heir with my son, Isaac.'

Gal 4:22–26 **PAR**

For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the servant, and one by the free woman. However, the son by the servant was born according to the flesh, but the son by the free woman was born through promise. These things contain an allegory, for these are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai, bearing children to bondage, which is Hagar. For this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answers to the Jerusalem that exists now, for she is in bondage with her children. But the Jerusalem that is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

Source: Marc. V.4; Panarion 42.11.15f. (footnote \#125 combines Gal 3:13 and 4:23 in a single citation, cross-ref Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.3.10 and 4.8). Paul maps the two sons of Abraham onto two covenants: Hagar/Sinai/earthly Jerusalem = bondage; Sarah/promise/heavenly

Jerusalem = freedom. Marcion reads this as Paul's own testimony that the Sinai covenant — the Creator's covenant — produces slaves, while the covenant of promise produces free children of the good God. The OT account of Hagar being cast out (Gen 21:10) is then applied: "cast out" the slave-covenant. Tertullian (Marc. V.4) argues that both covenants issue from the same Creator who "sketched them out beforehand." Epiphanius (footnote \#125) combines Gal 3:13 and 4:23 in a single citation, showing that Marcion read the curse-antithesis and the two-covenants allegory as a continuous argument. The SUS flags on 4:24–25 are significant: the explicit allegorical identification of "Hagar = Mount Sinai = present Jerusalem" is consistent with a later canonical addition — editors spelling out what the earlier text left implied, in order to make the allegory's application precise and thereby reduce its openness to Marcionite use. On the series' thesis, Marcion did not edit the text; he received an earlier form of it. If 4:24–25 are post-Marcionite additions, Marcion's Galatians had the allegory present (vv. 22–23, 26) but without the explicit geographic-theological gloss, leaving the mapping implied rather than declared outright.

Contradiction: The same God cannot be the author of the Sinai covenant — which Paul says produces children of bondage — and also the author of the covenant of promise that produces free children of the heavenly Jerusalem. Paul's own instruction is "cast out the slave woman." If the same God authored both covenants, he is being told through his own apostle to cast out his own primary covenant. The text itself presents two sources, not one deity with two plans.

Isa 29:14

Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvelous work among this people... The wisdom of their wise men will perish, and the understanding of their understanding men will be hidden.

1 Cor 1:19–25

For it is written, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, I will bring the discernment of the discerning to nothing.' Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the lawyer of this world? Hasn't God made foolish the wisdom of this world?... we preach Christ crucified; a stumbling block to Jews, and foolishness to Greeks, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

Source: Marc. V.5–6; Panarion 42.11.15f. (passage 1(9) from 1 Corinthians = 1 Cor 1:19 citing Isa 29:14, footnote \#132). Paul cites Isaiah to announce the Creator's destruction of human wisdom — but Marcion reads the irony as Paul turning this prophecy against the Creator's own dispensation: Jewish wisdom (Torah-scholarship) and Greek wisdom are both cancelled by the cross, which belongs to an entirely different order of reality. The "stumbling block to Jews" implies the Creator's own people cannot receive the good God's gospel — confirming the two-deity reading. Paul's declaration that the Creator's own prophet predicted the end of worldly wisdom is, for Marcion, evidence that even the OT contained seeds of its own supersession. Epiphanius (Panarion 42.11.15f.) explicitly lists 1 Cor 1:19 as the first passage he cites from Marcion's 1 Corinthians as a retained "witness." In Companion B, 1 Cor 1:18–25 survives intact.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom and the prophetic tradition as the highest mode of knowing him and also be the one who has made that wisdom foolish, and who presents his gospel as a stumbling block specifically to the people that tradition was addressed to. If Torah-wisdom was genuinely the path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which God's own people failed to find him. The cross being a "stumbling block to Jews" implies the Creator's covenant people are specifically excluded from recognising the good God's act.

Deut 6:25

It shall be our righteousness if we are careful to do all this commandment before Yahweh our God, as he has commanded us." Also Lev 18:5 (quoted in Gal 3:12): "You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances; which if a man does, he shall live in them.

Rom 3:21–22, 27–28 **PAR**

But now apart from the law, a righteousness of God has been revealed; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ to all and on all those who believe... Where then is the boasting? It is excluded. By what kind of law? Of works? No, but by a law of faith. We maintain therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law.

Source: Marc. V.13; Panarion 42.11.15f. (passages 1–3 from Romans include law-referencing material). "Apart from the law, a righteousness of God has been revealed" is the central declaration of Pauline soteriology and the sharpest single statement of law-supersession in the Apostolikon. Marcion reads "apart from" (χωρίς νόμου) as total independence from the Creator's economy. The OT (Deut 6:25; Lev 18:5) makes observance of all commandments the very definition of righteousness before God; Rom 3:21 says righteousness has been revealed on completely different terms. Tertullian (Marc. V.13) contends that the "righteousness of God" is still the Creator's righteousness, now offered through faith rather than law. In Companion B, the absence of 3:23–26 (which explains the cross as the mechanism of this new righteousness) means the "apart from the law" declaration stands without the christological elaboration of the atonement, sharpening the antithesis.

Contradiction: The same God cannot define righteousness as careful observance of all his commandments and also reveal a righteousness that operates entirely apart from the law. "Apart from the law" means the law route is not the route. If the law route was genuinely God's prescribed path to righteousness, then a righteousness that bypasses it entirely is either an improvement on God's own provision — implying the first provision was deficient — or it comes from a different source entirely.

Deut 30:10

if you will obey Yahweh your God's voice, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this book of the law, if you turn to Yahweh your God with all your heart, and with all your soul.

Rom 10:4

For Christ is the fulfillment of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes.

Source: Marc. V.14 (approx.); Panarion 42.11.15f. (passage 7(34) = Rom 10:4, footnote \#117, cross-ref Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.14.6). Whether τέλος means “end” (termination) or “goal/fulfillment” was a live exegetical dispute; Marcion reads it as termination. The Creator’s covenant (Deut 30:10) requires complete obedience; Rom 10:4 declares that framework ended by Christ. Epiphanius explicitly includes Rom 10:4 among the passages Marcion retained from Romans (Panarion 42.11.15f., passage 7(34)). In Companion B, Romans 9–11 are largely absent (only fragments of 9:1–3 and 10:1–4 remain, along with 11:33–35); this means Rom 10:4 stands almost alone as the Romans chapter-10 testimony, without the surrounding discussion of Israel’s election and rejection. The verse’s antithetical force is thus more concentrated.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present law-obedience as the standing requirement for righteousness across the entire OT and also have sent a Christ whose coming terminates that requirement. If the law was genuinely God’s instrument for producing righteousness, it requires no termination. If Christ terminated it, then either the instrument was not working as claimed, or it was never genuinely God’s provision for righteousness in the first place.

Ps 143:2 (quoted in Gal 2:16 and Rom 3:20)

Don’t enter into judgment with your servant, for in your sight no man living is righteous.

Gal 2:16

yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law, because no flesh will be justified by the works of the law.

Source: Marc. V.2–3 (the primary Galatians discussion); Panarion 42.11.15f. (the Galatian passages cited, including footnote \#124). Gal 2:16 contains three successive affirmations of justification by faith “not by works of the law” — the densest single-verse formulation in the Apostolikon and the programmatic sentence Marcion regards as Paul’s core teaching. The OT framework (Lev 18:5; Deut 27:26) consistently presents law-observance as the condition of life and right-standing before the Creator; Gal 2:16 directly negates that linkage three times in a single verse. Tertullian (Marc. V.2–3) argues that faith and law belong to the same Creator who ordained both. In Companion B, Gal 3:6–9 is absent from the proto-Pauline text Marcion received — later editors inserted it into canonical Paul to supply an Abrahamic genealogy. Without it, Gal 2:16’s “not by works of the law” stands without the typological anchor in Creator-history that canonical Paul provides; it reads more like a naked antithesis.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate law-observance as the condition of life before him and also be the source of three successive declarations that “no flesh will be justified by the works of the law.” These are a direct logical contradiction. If law-observance genuinely produces life and justification, then some flesh is justified by it. If no flesh is justified by it, the law never produced what the OT claimed it would. Both claims cannot come from the same deity’s genuine word.

Part II — Derived Antitheses: The Apostolikon Against the Old Testament

Part II derives antitheses directly from the text of Companion B. Each entry identifies a passage in the reconstructed Pauline letters that directly contradicts an Old Testament passage on the same specific claim. These entries are not historically attested; they are the result of reading the reconstructed corpus against the sources it is most often harmonised with. The quality threshold is strict: only entries where the OT passage makes an explicit claim and the Apostolikon passage directly contradicts that same claim are included. The entries are organised by theme across ten chapters.

The Law: Blessing or Curse?

The Old Testament presents the law as Israel's life, wisdom, and path to righteousness. Paul presents adherence to the law as a curse and law-observance as incompatible with grace. The 2 Corinthians 3 entries are among the sharpest in this section: Paul calls the giving of the law at Sinai "the ministry of death" and "the ministry of condemnation" — the same event the Old Testament presents as luminous and restorative. The later interpolations absent from Companion B (especially Romans 9–11's olive-tree allegory and Galatians 3:15–25's law-as-guardian passage) were inserted by editors to provide a developmental theology that softened this binary. Without those insertions, the law is simply a curse from which Christ redeemed.

Deut 28:1-2

If you will listen diligently to Yahweh your God's voice, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command you today, that Yahweh your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth. All these blessings will come upon you, and overtake you, if you listen to Yahweh your God's voice.

Gal 3:10

For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse. For it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who doesn't continue in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them.'

Deuteronomy 28 is the foundational covenantal prospectus: full compliance with the law's commands produces blessing and elevation above all nations. Galatians 3:10 reverses this completely: rather than those who pursue the law's works receiving blessings, they are under a curse — and Paul quotes Deuteronomy itself to prove it. The antithesis is not between two different texts but within a single covenantal framework: the OT says the law is the path to blessing; Gal 3:10 says positioning oneself in relation to law-works places one already under curse, before any accounting of compliance.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Lev 18:5

You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances; which if a man does, he shall live in them. I am Yahweh.

Gal 3:11

Now that no man is justified by the law before God is evident, for, ‘The righteous will live by faith.’

Leviticus 18:5 makes the explicit claim that doing the statutes and ordinances produces life — this is the OT warrant for law observance as a life-giving path. Galatians 3:11 directly contradicts this specific claim: no man is justified by the law before God, not “no man is able” in a merely practical sense, but “it is evident” as a matter of principle. Paul’s counter-citation of Habakkuk against Leviticus is itself a move within Scripture; but the theological claim stands in direct opposition: the law does not confer justification or life before God.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 119:97-105

Oh how I love your law! It is my meditation all day. Your commandments make me wiser than my enemies, for your commandments are always with me.

Gal 3:12

The law is not of faith, but, ‘The man who does them will live by them.’

Psalm 119 is the supreme celebration of the law as the object of love, meditation, and trust — a relationship of wholehearted devotion to Torah as the path of wisdom and life. Galatians 3:12 severs the connection between law and faith entirely: the law operates on a different logic, the logic of doing rather than trusting. The OT psalmist presents Torah-devotion as the highest spiritual posture; Paul declares that posture is categorically different in kind from faith, and therefore cannot be the basis of justification.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 27:26

Cursed is he who doesn’t confirm the words of this law by doing them. All the people shall say, Amen.

Gal 3:13

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us. For it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree,’

Deuteronomy 27:26 establishes that the law itself generates curses for non-compliance — the covenantal assembly ratifies this. The OT framework assumes that compliance avoids the curse and non-compliance incurs it; the curse is a consequence of failing the law, not

an inherent feature of the law-system itself. Galatians 3:13 overturns this: the curse is structural — it attaches to those **under** the law — and escape required Christ becoming a curse, not a moral achievement within the law's framework. The redemption narrative implies the law produced a condition from which redemption was necessary.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 30:11-16

For this commandment which I command you today is not too hard for you, neither is it far off... I call heaven and earth to witness against you today that I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose life.

Gal 2:16

yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law, because no flesh will be justified by the works of the law.

Deuteronomy 30 makes the foundational claim that the commandment is accessible and that choosing to do it is choosing life — the law is a realistic and life-conferring option. Galatians 2:16 contradicts this with the sweeping negative: “no flesh will be justified by the works of the law.” This is not a claim about practical difficulty but a categorical denial. The OT presents law-keeping as the realistic path to life that Israel is called to choose; Paul declares that path does not produce justification for any human being, including Jewish believers who already kept it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 32:46-47

Set your heart to all the words which I testify to you today... because it is not an empty thing for you; because it is your life, and through this thing you shall prolong your days in the land.

Gal 2:19

For I, through the law, died to the law, that I might live to God.

Deuteronomy 32 declares the law to be Israel's very life — not an adjunct to life but life itself, the source of longevity and flourishing in the land. To abandon the law is to abandon life. Galatians 2:19 directly inverts this: Paul died **to** the law — the law became the ground

of his death — and that death enabled life toward God. The OT frames the law as the path to life; Gal 2:19 frames death to the law as the precondition for authentic life before God.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Lev 18:5

You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances; which if a man does, he shall live in them. I am Yahweh.

Gal 2:21

I don't reject the grace of God. For if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for nothing!

Leviticus 18:5 establishes that the law is the mechanism for obtaining life — compliance with statutes and ordinances is the prescribed route to right standing. Galatians 2:21 frames this directly as a dilemma: if the OT is correct that righteousness comes through the law, then Christ's death was unnecessary — it accomplished nothing. Paul clearly affirms the latter: the law could not produce righteousness, therefore the cross was necessary. These are mutually exclusive accounts of whether the law-system was sufficient.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Josh 1:8

This book of the law shall not depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, that you may observe to do according to all that is written in it; for then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall have good success.

Gal 3:22

But the Scriptures imprisoned all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe.

Joshua 1:8 presents the law as the instrument of prosperity and success: continual meditation and observance produces good outcomes. Scripture is the path to flourishing. Galatians 3:22 uses the same word "Scriptures" to make the opposite claim: the Scriptures functioned not as a path to flourishing but as a cage, imprisoning everything under sin so that the promise could only come through faith. The OT characterises the law as liberating and prospering; Paul characterises it as confining all things in a condition of sin from which they could not escape by law-keeping.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one

plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 1:1-2

Blessed is the man who doesn't walk in the counsel of the wicked, nor stand in the way of sinners, nor sit in the seat of scoffers; but his delight is in Yahweh's law. On his law he meditates day and night.

Gal 5:1

Stand firm therefore in the liberty by which Christ has made us free, and don't be entangled again with a yoke of bondage.

Psalms 1 opens the Psalter with the declaration that delight in Yahweh's law is the defining mark of the blessed person — it is freedom and wisdom, not bondage. Galatians 5:1 characterises returning to law-observance as becoming “entangled again with a yoke of bondage” — the specific thing from which Christ has liberated believers. The OT presents the law as delight and blessing; Paul presents re-engagement with it as a yoke that enslaves.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 30:11-16

I call heaven and earth to witness against you today that I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose life.

Gal 5:4

You are alienated from Christ, you who desire to be justified by the law. You have fallen away from grace.

Deuteronomy 30 frames law-keeping as the life-choice: to choose the law is to choose life. Galatians 5:4 declares that those who “desire to be justified by the law” have not chosen life — they have become alienated from Christ and have fallen from grace. What Deuteronomy presents as the life-choice, Paul declares to be separation from Christ. The OT and Companion B make contradictory claims about what law-orientation produces for the person who embraces it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 19:7-9

Yahweh's law is perfect, restoring the soul. Yahweh's testimony is sure, making wise the simple. Yahweh's precepts are right, rejoicing the heart. Yahweh's commandment is pure, enlightening the eyes.

Gal 5:18

But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law.

Psalm 19:7-9 presents the law as perfect in function: it restores the soul, imparts wisdom, rejoices the heart, and enlightens the eyes. Being under the law's influence is the path to spiritual flourishing. Galatians 5:18 makes the categorical claim that Spirit-led existence is characterised by not being under the law — the two conditions are mutually exclusive. The OT presents law-adherence as the spiritually formative path; Paul presents it as a condition from which the Spirit-led person has been freed.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 19:7

Yahweh's law is perfect, restoring the soul. Yahweh's testimony is sure, making wise the simple.

Rom 3:21 PAR

But now apart from the law, a righteousness of God has been revealed;

Psalm 19:7 claims the law is the perfect restoring and life-giving instrument — the mechanism through which right relationship with God is maintained. Romans 3:21 declares that God's righteousness has been revealed **apart from** the law — the prepositional phrase "apart from" is the antithesis. The OT claims law is the instrument of God's righteous workings in human life; Romans 3:21 claims the decisive revelation of God's righteousness operates entirely outside that instrument.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 28:1-2

If you will listen diligently to Yahweh your God's voice, to observe and to do all his commandments... that Yahweh your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth. All these blessings will come upon you.

Rom 3:28

We maintain therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law.

Deuteronomy 28 grounds its entire blessing-structure in observance: it is observance of commands that causes God to elevate and bless. Romans 3:28 makes the logically incompatible claim that justification — right standing before God — is by faith **apart from** the works of the law. These are two different accounts of what produces right standing before God: the OT says doing the commandments; Paul says faith independent of commandment-doing.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 32:46-47

Set your heart to all the words which I testify to you today, which you shall command your children to observe and do, even all the words of this law. For it is not an empty thing for you; because it is your life, and through this thing you shall prolong your days in the land which you go over the Jordan to possess.

Rom 5:20

The law came in besides, that the trespass might abound; but where sin abounded, grace abounded more exceedingly;

Deuteronomy 32 declares the law to be life itself — its transmission to children is the path to prolonged days in the land. The law's function is life-giving. Romans 5:20 assigns the law a completely contrary function: it came in order that "the trespass might abound." The OT says the law's purpose is to give and extend life; Paul says the law's purpose in the larger divine economy was to multiply transgression. These are direct contradictions on the question of what the law was designed to accomplish.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Neh 9:13

You also came down on Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them right ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments,

Rom 6:14

For sin will not have dominion over you. For you are not under law, but under grace.

Nehemiah 9:13 identifies the Sinai ordinances and laws as "right," "true," and "good" — given by God from heaven as the authoritative regime for human life. Being under the law is the condition of those who have received God's good gift. Romans 6:14 declares that

the condition enabling freedom from sin's dominion is precisely **not being under law** — the two conditions (under law / under grace) are presented as alternatives, with grace being the one that liberates. The OT presents the Sinai law-regime as the good and right condition; Paul presents not being under that regime as the condition of freedom.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 30:11-16

For this commandment which I command you today is not too hard for you, neither is it far off... it is in your mouth, and in your heart, that you may do it... I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose life.

Rom 8:2

For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death.

Deuteronomy 30 argues that the commandment is not too hard and not far off — it is accessible and its observance is the life-choice. Romans 8:2 names the Mosaic law “the law of sin and of death” — from which the “law of the Spirit of life” has set believers free. The OT calls the commandment life; Paul calls its regime the law of death. The freedom Paul celebrates is freedom **from** what Deuteronomy calls the accessible life-path.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Lev 18:5

You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances; which if a man does, he shall live in them. I am Yahweh.

Rom 8:3

For what the law couldn't do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God did, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh;

Leviticus 18:5 claims the law **can** produce life — “if a man does, he shall live in them.” The law's life-giving capacity is assumed as the basis of the entire covenantal framework. Romans 8:3 directly contradicts this claim of capability: there were things the law **could not** do — it was “weak through the flesh,” meaning the law's mechanism failed in application to embodied human beings. The OT asserts the law's sufficiency for life; Paul asserts the law's incapacity, requiring divine intervention from outside the law-system entirely.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one

plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Josh 1:8

This book of the law shall not depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, that you may observe to do according to all that is written in it; for then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall have good success.

Rom 10:4

For Christ is the fulfillment of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes.

Joshua 1:8 presents the law as an ongoing, permanent instrument whose continuous observance produces prosperity and success — the law is not to depart from the mouth and is the sustained source of flourishing. Romans 10:4 declares Christ to be the τέλος (termination/end) of the law for righteousness — the law’s jurisdiction over righteousness ends at Christ. The OT presents the law as permanent and continuous in its life-giving function; Romans 10:4 (on the termination reading supported by the callout note in this reconstruction) declares that function to have ended. The note in the Companion B file confirms: “the law is over. Christ is where it ended.”

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 19:7-8

Yahweh’s law is perfect, restoring the soul. Yahweh’s testimony is sure, making wise the simple. Yahweh’s precepts are right, rejoicing the heart. Yahweh’s commandment is pure, enlightening the eyes.

2 Cor 3:6

who also made us sufficient as servants of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the Spirit. For the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.

Psalms 19 assigns to Yahweh’s law specific life-restoring and soul-recovering functions: it is perfect, pure, sure — it restores, makes wise, rejoices, enlightens. The law is the life-giving instrument par excellence. Second Corinthians 3:6 directly contradicts this: “the letter kills.” Paul assigns the written law the function Psalm 19 ascribes to it and inverts it: where the Psalm says “restoring the soul,” Paul says “kills.” The life-function Psalm 19 ascribes to Torah is reassigned to the Spirit alone, while the written ordinance gets the function of death.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One

source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Neh 9:13

You also came down on Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them right ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments,

2 Cor 3:7

But if the service of death, written engraved on stones, came with glory, so that the children of Israel could not look steadfastly on the face of Moses for the glory of his face, which was passing away;

Nehemiah 9:13 describes the Sinai legislation as “right ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments” — given from heaven as a gift of genuine goodness. Second Corinthians 3:7 names the same thing — “written engraved on stones” identifying the same Sinai event — as “the service of death.” The OT calls those stone-engraved ordinances good and right; Paul calls the ministry associated with them the service of death. Even Paul’s concession that it came with glory does not soften the antithesis: the stone-engraved system is the death-service.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 28:1-2

All these blessings will come upon you, and overtake you, if you listen to Yahweh your God’s voice.

2 Cor 3:9

For if the service of condemnation has glory, the service of righteousness exceeds much more in glory.

Deuteronomy 28 characterises the law-system as a service of blessing: all the blessings of the covenant overtake those who obey. The covenantal law-regime is a blessing-service. Second Corinthians 3:9 names the same law-regime “the service of condemnation” — the law ministers condemnation rather than blessing. These are contradictory descriptions of what the Sinai covenant administration actually delivers to those under it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 119:97-105

Oh how I love your law! It is my meditation all day. Your commandments make me wiser than my enemies, for your commandments are always with me... Your word is a lamp to my feet, and a light for my path.

2 Cor 3:11

For if that which passes away was with glory, much more that which remains is in glory.

Psalm 119 celebrates the law as the permanent lamp and light — “always with me” — and loves it with unwavering devotion as a perpetual guide. The permanence and ongoing illuminating function of Torah is assumed throughout. Second Corinthians 3:11 characterises “that which passes away” — the law-covenant identified in the surrounding context as the engraved stone service — as something with glory but impermanent. What Psalm 119 presents as the permanent light and perennial guide, Paul characterises as transient, passing away.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ezra 7:6

This Ezra went up from Babylon. He was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which Yahweh, the God of Israel, had given.

2 Cor 3:14

But their minds were hardened, for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remains, because in Christ it passes away.

Ezra 7:6 presents the law of Moses as the definitive, God-given instrument whose expert reading is the highest credential of the restored community — the law is the living word to which every faithful teacher attends. Second Corinthians 3:14 declares that reading the same law-covenant produces a veiled and hardened mind — not wisdom but blindness. The OT presents law-reading as the path to clarity and God’s purposes; Paul declares that reading “the old covenant” without Christ leaves the veil in place.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 28:1-2

All these blessings will come upon you, and overtake you, if you listen to Yahweh your God’s voice.

Phil 3:7-9

However, I consider those things that were gain to me as a loss for Christ. Yes most certainly, and I count all things to be a loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord, for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and count them nothing but refuse, that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith;

Deuteronomy 28 presents law-compliance as the source of blessing and elevation — the more one does, the more divine favour accrues. Paul himself had been blameless under the law (Phil 3:6) — exactly the condition Deuteronomy says produces blessing. Philippians 3:7-9 describes that entire law-righteous track record as “refuse” (σκόβαλα) and specifically rejects “a righteousness of my own, that which is of the law” in favour of the righteousness from God through faith. The OT presents law-derived righteousness as the blessing-producing outcome; Paul categorises it as loss and explicitly repudiates it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Neh 9:13

You also came down on Mount Sinai, and spoke with them from heaven, and gave them right ordinances and true laws, good statutes and commandments,

Eph 2:15

having abolished in his flesh the hostility, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man of the two, making peace;

Nehemiah 9:13 characterises the Sinai ordinances as “right,” “true,” and “good” — God’s direct gift from heaven to Israel, a permanent covenantal framework. Ephesians 2:15 declares that Christ “abolished in his flesh the hostility, the law of commandments contained in ordinances.” The OT presents the commandments-in-ordinances as a permanent good gift; Ephesians 2:15 identifies that same structure as “hostility” and declares it abolished.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 30:11-16

For this commandment which I command you today is not too hard for you, neither is it far off... I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose life.

Col 2:14

wiping out the handwriting in ordinances which was against us; and he has taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross;

Deuteronomy 30 presents the commandment as something close, accessible, and life-giving — nothing about it is against the one who obeys it. Colossians 2:14 characterises the “handwriting in ordinances” — the written law-document — as something “against us,” a debt-record working to our disadvantage that had to be removed by being nailed to the cross. The OT declares the commandment is not too hard and not against you; Colossians 2:14 declares the ordinance-document was against us and required crucifixion to neutralize its claim.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 32:46-47

Set your heart to all the words which I testify to you today, which you shall command your children to observe and do, even all the words of this law. For it is not an empty thing for you; because it is your life.

Gal 4:3-5

So we also, when we were children, were held in bondage under the elemental principles of the world. But when the fullness of the time came, God sent out his Son that he might redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of children.

Deuteronomy 32 commands transmission of the law to children as life itself — the law’s words are life, and children are commanded to observe them. Galatians 4:3-5 characterises being “under the law” as a state of childhood bondage under elemental principles — not as life, but as minority-slavery from which redemption was needed. The OT presents law-transmission to children as the gift of life; Paul presents being “under the law” as the condition of the heir-as-slave from whom Christ came to redeem.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Ps 19:7-9

Yahweh’s law is perfect, restoring the soul... The fear of Yahweh is clean, enduring forever.

Gal 4:9

But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, why do you turn back again to the weak and miserable elemental principles, to which you desire to be in bondage all over again?

Psalm 19 presents the law as perfect, pure, clean, and enduring forever — something of permanent spiritual worth. Galatians 4:9 characterises the things being returned to — in context, the law-observant practices associated with the elemental principles — as “weak and miserable.” The OT characterises the law as perfection that endures; Paul calls the same system of observance “weak” (unable to do what it promises) and “miserable” (pitifully inadequate). These are direct contrasts on what the law-observant system actually is in its character and capacity.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Deut 32:46-47

because it is your life, and through this thing you shall prolong your days in the land.

1 Cor 15:56

SUS

The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law.

Deuteronomy 32 declares the law to be life and the means of prolonging days. The law is the anti-death instrument, the power of life in the covenantal framework. First Corinthians 15:56 (suspected; present in the text but flagged) directly inverts this: the law is “the power of sin” — the thing that amplifies sin’s capacity, not life’s capacity. Where Deuteronomy says the law is life and prolongs days, Paul says the law is what gives sin its power. This entry is noted SUS and should be cited with that qualification.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare the law to be the path to life and also declare that those who pursue the law are thereby under a curse. These are not two stages of one plan; they are contradictory claims about what law-observance produces before God. One source is offering life through obedience; the other is saying that posture already places you under condemnation.

Circumcision: Covenant Sign or Nullity?

The Old Testament makes circumcision the non-negotiable boundary marker of the covenant with Abraham — the uncircumcised man is “cut off from his people” (Gen 17:14). Paul calls circumcision a matter of complete indifference (1 Cor 7:19), then a threat to salvation (Gal 5:2), then “mutilation” (katatome, Phil 3:2). Note that Gal 3:6–9 — absent from Companion B because it was not in the proto-Pauline text Marcion received — would have grounded this in Old Testament genealogy (Abraham believed before being circumcised). Without it, Paul’s position has no Old Testament warrant at all. Romans 4, likewise absent from the proto-Pauline text and later inserted into canonical Paul, would have supplied the argument that Abraham’s uncircumcised faith preceded and superseded his circumcision; without that insertion, there is no Pauline bridge for the claim in the Apostolikon. What remains is the bare assertion that circumcision counts for nothing.

Gen 17:10-11

This is my covenant, which you shall keep, between me and you and your offspring after you. Every male among you shall be circumcised. You shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you.

Gal 2:3

But not even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.

Genesis 17:10-11 states that **every** male must be circumcised as the sign of the covenant — there are no exceptions. Galatians 2:3 reports that Titus, a Greek male in Paul’s company, was not compelled to be circumcised — and Paul presents this non-circumcision not as a scandal or oversight but as a deliberate and correct outcome. The OT requires universal male circumcision; Paul’s account presents the deliberate non-circumcision of a Greek man as the expected result of his gospel.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Gen 17:9-14

Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people. He has broken my covenant.

Gal 5:2

Behold, I, Paul, tell you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing.

Genesis 17:9-14 makes circumcision the condition for remaining in the covenant — the uncircumcised male is “cut off from his people” and has “broken my covenant.” The OT makes circumcision the gateway to covenant standing. Galatians 5:2 reverses the logic entirely: receiving circumcision does not add covenant standing — it causes Christ to profit nothing. The OT says circumcision is indispensable to covenant; Paul says circumcision nullifies the benefit of Christ.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Gen 17:9-14

God said to Abraham, ‘As for you, you shall keep my covenant, you and your descendants after you throughout their generations.’

Gal 5:3

Yes, I testify again to every man who receives circumcision, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.

Genesis 17 frames circumcision as the sign of entering covenant obligation — those circumcised are within the covenant relationship and its blessings. The OT presents circumcision as the mark of covenant inclusion, with obligations following as a covenantal gift. Galatians 5:3 reframes this entry-point negatively: circumcision makes a man a **debtor** to the whole law — not a covenant member receiving blessings, but one incurring a comprehensive debt that cannot be discharged.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Lev 12:3

In the eighth day, the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.

Gal 5:6

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision amounts to anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love.

Leviticus 12:3 mandates circumcision on the eighth day as a religious obligation with no stated exceptions — the command is precise, scheduled, and unconditional. Galatians 5:6 declares that in Christ Jesus “neither circumcision amounts to anything” — the act prescribed in Leviticus and repeatedly commanded in the covenant documents simply does not count. The OT says the act matters; Paul says the act is nothing.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Gen 17:9-14

As for you, you shall keep my covenant... every male among you shall be circumcised.

Gal 6:12-13

As many as desire to make a good impression in the flesh compel you to be circumcised; just so they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ. For even they who receive circumcision don't keep the law themselves, but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may boast in your flesh.

Genesis 17 presents circumcision as a covenant obligation undertaken in good faith. Galatians 6:12-13 exposes the advocates of circumcision as motivated not by covenantal faithfulness but by social pressure and boasting — “they don't keep the law themselves.” The OT grounds circumcision in covenant integrity; Paul reveals the actual dynamic as self-interested performance.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Gen 17:9-14

Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people. He has broken my covenant.

Gal 6:15

For in Christ Jesus neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation.

Genesis 17:9-14 assigns circumcision ultimate covenantal significance: the uncircumcised male is “cut off” and has “broken my covenant.” The act is the decisive sign separating those in covenant from those outside it. Galatians 6:15 removes all significance from the act: “neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision.” The operative category is “new creation,” which replaces the circumcision/uncircumcision binary the OT makes foundational.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Gen 17:10-11

Every male among you shall be circumcised. You shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you.

1 Cor 7:19

Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.

Genesis 17 declares circumcision to be the sign of the covenant between God and Abraham's male descendants — a sign, by definition, that signifies something essential. First Corinthians 7:19 declares both circumcision and uncircumcision to be “nothing” — not slightly less important, but nothing at all. The OT says it is a sign (something); Paul says it is nothing. The specific word “nothing” (οὐδέν) makes this a direct logical negation of the OT's claim about circumcision's significance.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Gen 17:9-14

Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people. He has broken my covenant.

Phil 3:2-3

Beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers, beware of the false circumcision. For we are the circumcision, who worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh;

Genesis 17 defines the circumcision as those who have submitted to the physical covenant sign. Philippians 3:2-3 appropriates the category “the circumcision” for those who worship in the Spirit and have no confidence in the flesh, while calling physical circumcision advocates “the false circumcision.” The OT defines circumcision by the flesh-act; Paul redefines “the circumcision” as those who have abandoned confidence in the flesh.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Lev 12:3

In the eighth day, the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.

Col 2:11

in whom you were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ;

Leviticus 12:3 prescribes circumcision as a specific physical act performed by human hands on the eighth day — the flesh of the foreskin is the precise object and location. Colossians 2:11 declares the operative circumcision to be one “not made with hands” — explicitly contrasting with the physical act. The OT makes the act performed by human hands in the flesh the covenant sign; Paul declares the effective circumcision to be one that no human hand performs.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

Ex 4:24-26

On the way, in a lodging place, Yahweh met him and wanted to kill him. Then Zipporah took a flint, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet; and she said, ‘Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me.’ So he let him alone.

Rom 3:30

since indeed there is one God who will justify the circumcised by faith, and the uncircumcised through faith.

Exodus 4:24-26 is the most extreme statement of circumcision’s necessity in the OT: God attempted to kill Moses because his son was uncircumcised, and circumcision was what halted the divine threat. Circumcision here is a life-or-death requirement that even the covenant mediator must observe. Romans 3:30 places circumcised and uncircumcised in the same position before the one God — both are justified through faith, with no differentiation in principle. The OT makes circumcision a life-or-death boundary before God; Paul declares God justifies the uncircumcised through faith on the same basis as the circumcised.

Contradiction: The same God cannot declare circumcision to be an everlasting covenant sign and also declare that in Christ circumcision is nothing. An eternal covenant sign cannot become nothing. Either the author revoked his own permanent ordinance, or the two declarations come from different sources.

The Character of God: Wrath, Jealousy, and Terror

The contrast between Paul's God of unconditional love and the Old Testament God of retribution and consuming fire is the oldest observation in Marcionite scholarship. Companion B makes it sharper because Romans 13:1–7 — the passage that presented the Old Testament God's political authority structure as Paul's own — is absent. What remains is the God who acts for the ungodly while they are still enemies; the God from whose love nothing in creation can separate the believer; the God whose Spirit produces adoption rather than fear. Set against the Old Testament's God who jealously punishes iniquity to the third and fourth generation, who sends consuming fire for murmuring, and who appears at Sinai in thunder and earthquake, the contrast is structural rather than incidental.

Ex 20:5

for I, Yahweh your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, on the third and on the fourth generation of those who hate me,

Rom 5:8

But God commends his own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Exodus 20:5 presents God visiting iniquity across multiple generations — punishment for those who hate him extends to children and grandchildren who did not personally sin. The operative divine response to human failure is generational retribution. Romans 5:8 presents God's operative character as love demonstrated **toward sinners** — not retribution toward sinners and their descendants, but self-giving toward them while they were still in their sin. These are directly opposed characterisations of what God does in response to human moral failure.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Josh 24:19-20

Joshua said to the people, 'You can't serve Yahweh; for he is a holy God. He is a jealous God. He will not forgive your disobedience nor your sins. If you forsake Yahweh, and

serve foreign gods, then he will turn and do you evil, and consume you, after he has done you good.'

Rom 5:10

For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we will be saved by his life.

Joshua 24:19-20 is an explicit statement of divine non-forgiveness: God will not forgive your disobedience or your sins, and if you forsake him he will do you evil and consume you. Romans 5:10 declares that when believers were "enemies" — precisely the condition Joshua describes — God worked their reconciliation through Christ's death. Where Joshua says God cannot or will not forgive enemies, Paul says God reconciled enemies through the Son's death while they were still in that enmity.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 34:7

keeping loving kindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and disobedience and sin; and who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, and on the children's children, on the third and on the fourth generation.

Rom 8:1

There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who don't walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit.

Exodus 34:7 declares that God "by no means clears the guilty" and visits iniquity generationally — condemnation and punishment are the operative divine responses to guilt, even extending to descendants. The guilty are not cleared. Romans 8:1 makes the categorical declaration: "there is therefore now no condemnation." The "no" directly contradicts the OT's insistence on the guilty not being cleared. Paul's "no condemnation" in Christ is the precise inverse of Exodus 34's "by no means clearing the guilty."

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 20:18-20

All the people perceived the thunderings, the lightnings, the sound of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking. When the people saw it, they trembled, and stayed at a distance... Moses said to the people, 'Don't be afraid, for God has come to test you, and that his fear may be before you, that you won't sin.'

Rom 8:15

For you didn't receive the spirit of bondage again to fear, but you received the Spirit of adoption, by whom we cry, 'Abba! Father!'

Exodus 20:18-20 narrates the Sinai encounter as an event of overwhelming terror, and Moses explicitly declares that the fear produced is the purpose: "that his fear may be before you." Fear of God is the designed pedagogical outcome of the divine presence at Sinai. Romans 8:15 declares that believers "did not receive the spirit of bondage again to fear" — the Sinai-pattern of fearful bondage has been replaced by the Spirit of adoption. What the OT presents as the deliberately designed outcome (fear before God), Paul presents as the condition left behind.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Nahum 1:2-3

Yahweh is a jealous God and avenges. Yahweh avenges and is full of wrath. Yahweh takes vengeance on his adversaries, and he maintains wrath against his enemies. Yahweh is slow to anger, and great in power, and will by no means leave the guilty unpunished.

Rom 8:38-39

For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing, will be able to separate us from God's love, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Nahum 1:2-3 presents a God who maintains wrath against enemies and will by no means leave the guilty unpunished — the divine character is described precisely as the maintenance of punitive separation between God and the guilty. Romans 8:38-39 declares that nothing in creation can separate believers from God's love. Where Nahum defines God's character by sustained wrath and maintained punishment, Paul defines it by inseparable love.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 34:7

who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, and on the children's children, on the third and on the fourth generation.

Rom 8:33

Who could bring a charge against God's chosen ones? It is God who justifies.

Exodus 34:7 explicitly says God does not clear the guilty — the divine character includes the judicial function of maintaining guilt's consequence. Romans 8:33 asks rhetorically who can bring a charge against God's chosen and answers: it is God who justifies. The OT presents God as the one who maintains guilt and visits it generationally; Paul presents God as the one who justifies, making any accusation against the chosen pointless.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 34:7

who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, and on the children's children, on the third and on the fourth generation.

2 Cor 5:19

namely, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not reckoning to them their trespasses, and having committed to us the word of reconciliation.

Exodus 34:7 is the explicit OT statement of divine reckoning: God does not clear the guilty but visits — reckons — the iniquity to children and descendants. Second Corinthians 5:19 declares the opposite: God in Christ was “not reckoning to them their trespasses.” The word “reckoning” (λογιζόμενος) is the exact accounting term; its negation is the direct reversal of what Exodus 34:7 declares God does.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Josh 24:19-20

He is a holy God. He is a jealous God. He will not forgive your disobedience nor your sins.

2 Cor 5:21

For him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.

Joshua 24:19-20 makes explicit that God's holiness and jealousy mean he will not forgive disobedience and sins — the holy/jealous God does not extend forgiveness, making right standing impossible for the disobedient. Second Corinthians 5:21 presents the mechanism by which sinners become “the righteousness of God” in Christ. Where Joshua says God will not forgive sins, Paul describes a transactional act by which sinners are made righteousness.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Deut 28:15-20

But if you will not listen to the voice of Yahweh your God... that all these curses will come on you, and overtake you... Yahweh will send on you cursing, confusion, and rebuke, in all that you put your hand to do, until you are destroyed...

Gal 1:4

who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father—

Deuteronomy 28:15-20 describes a divine judgment framework in which disobedience brings curse, confusion, and destruction from God — the present age is one structured by divine retributive response to sin. Galatians 1:4 characterises “this present evil age” as something from which Christ delivers — and the mechanism is not law-compliance but Christ giving himself for sins. The OT frames the divine response to sin as curse in this age; Paul frames the age itself as something requiring escape.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 34:7

who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, and on the children's children, on the third and on the fourth generation.

Eph 1:7

in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace,

Exodus 34:7 declares God will “by no means clear the guilty” — the guilty do not receive clearing. Ephesians 1:7 declares that believers have “the forgiveness of our trespasses” — a forgiveness that the OT text explicitly says the guilty do not receive. The phrase “by no means clear the guilty” is directly contradicted by the claim of forgiveness of trespasses available in Christ.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 34:14

for you shall worship no other god; for Yahweh, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God.

Eph 2:4-5

But God, being rich in mercy, for his great love with which he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ (by grace you have been saved),

Exodus 34:14 identifies God by the name “Jealous” — jealousy is not incidental but definitional; it is what Yahweh is called. Ephesians 2:4-5 opens its description of God with “rich in mercy” and “great love” — and specifically describes this love as operative even toward those who were dead in trespasses. The OT defines God’s essential name as Jealous; Paul defines the same God’s essential character as mercy-rich and great in love.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Amos 5:18-20

Woe to you who desire the day of Yahweh! Why do you long for the day of Yahweh? It is darkness, and not light... Won't the day of Yahweh be darkness, and not light? Even very dark, with no brightness in it?

Col 1:13

who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of his love;

Amos 5:18-20 presents the Day of Yahweh as pure darkness — inescapable, comprehensive, a day of divine judgment from which there is no exit. The divine administration of justice is characterised by overwhelming darkness without brightness. Colossians 1:13 declares that God has already delivered believers “out of the power of darkness” and translated them into the Kingdom of the Son. Where Amos presents the divine day as inescapable darkness, Paul declares an already-accomplished deliverance from darkness’s power.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Nahum 1:2-3

Yahweh is a jealous God and avenges... Yahweh takes vengeance on his adversaries, and he maintains wrath against his enemies... and will by no means leave the guilty unpunished.

Col 1:19-20

For all the fullness was pleased to dwell in him; and through him to reconcile all things to himself, by him, whether things on the earth, or things in the heavens.

Nahum 1:2-3 describes God’s character as one who maintains wrath against adversaries and will not leave the guilty unpunished — the divine orientation toward enemies is sustained vengeance and punishment. Colossians 1:19-20 declares that God’s purpose is to

“reconcile all things to himself” through Christ’s cross — a reconciliation that is comprehensive, extending to things on earth and in the heavens. Where Nahum presents sustained wrath against adversaries, Colossians presents the reconciliation of all things.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Deut 28:15-20

But if you will not listen to the voice of Yahweh your God... Yahweh will send on you cursing, confusion, and rebuke, in all that you put your hand to do, until you are destroyed and until you perish quickly; because of the evil of your doings, by which you have forsaken me.

1 Thess 5:9

For God didn’t appoint us to wrath, but to the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ,

Deuteronomy 28:15-20 presents the covenant as a framework in which disobedience triggers God’s appointment of curse, confusion, and destruction. First Thessalonians 5:9 declares that God “did not appoint us to wrath, but to the obtaining of salvation.” The word “appoint” (ἐθετο) directly contradicts the Deuteronomic logic of divine appointment for wrath against those who fail to comply.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ex 34:7

who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children, and on the children’s children, on the third and on the fourth generation.

1 Cor 13:5 **SUS**

doesn’t behave itself inappropriately, doesn’t seek its own way, is not provoked, takes no account of evil;

Exodus 34:7 is the OT’s most explicit statement of God accounting evil across generations. First Corinthians 13:5 (suspected) characterises love as taking “no account of evil” — love does not maintain a ledger of wrongs. The “no account of evil” directly inverts the OT’s generational accounting. This entry is noted SUS and should be cited with that qualification.

Contradiction: A God who maintains wrath against enemies, visits iniquity across generations, and will not clear the guilty cannot also be the source of unconditional love, the reconciliation of enemies, and the declaration that there is no condemnation. These are not two moods of one character; they are two incompatible characters.

Ethnic Election and the Universal Gospel

The Old Testament election of Israel is explicit and hierarchical — Israel is chosen “above all peoples” (Deut 7:6), “a kingdom of priests, a holy nation” above all the earth (Exod 19:5–6). Paul dissolves ethnic distinction as a precondition of the gospel: “neither Jew nor Greek... for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). The passage that would have reconciled this — Romans 9–11, the olive tree allegory, “all Israel shall be saved” — is absent from Companion B. Without it, Paul’s universalism leaves the Old Testament election claim standing without any Pauline resolution. The covenant promise to ethnic Israel simply hangs unaddressed across the corpus.

Deut 7:6

For you are a holy people to Yahweh your God. Yahweh your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples who are on the face of the earth.

Gal 3:28

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

Deuteronomy 7:6 makes the election of Israel explicit and ranked: Israel is chosen “above all peoples who are on the face of the earth.” The Jew/non-Jew distinction is fundamental to the covenantal order. Galatians 3:28 directly removes the Jew/Greek distinction from the framework of who stands before God: “there is neither Jew nor Greek.” The OT grounds the covenant in a distinction between Israel and all other peoples; Paul declares that distinction to be non-operative in Christ.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Ps 147:19–20

He shows his word to Jacob, his statutes and his ordinances to Israel. He has not done this for just any nation. They don’t know his ordinances. Praise Yah!

Rom 3:29

Or is God the God of Jews only? Isn’t he the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also,

Psalm 147:19–20 is the OT’s explicit statement of covenantal exclusivity: God revealed his word and ordinances to Israel specifically and “has not done this for just any nation.”

The OT explicitly says other nations do not know God's ordinances — they are outside the sphere of God's covenantal self-disclosure. Romans 3:29 takes exactly that exclusive claim and questions it: "Is God the God of Jews only?" — and answers definitively: "Yes, of Gentiles also." The OT says God has not done this for just any nation; Paul says God is the God of Gentiles also.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Deut 7:6

Yahweh your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples who are on the face of the earth.

Rom 3:30

since indeed there is one God who will justify the circumcised by faith, and the uncircumcised through faith.

Deuteronomy 7:6 positions Israel as God's chosen possession above all Gentile peoples. Romans 3:30 grounds both the circumcised (Israel) and the uncircumcised (Gentiles) in the same single God who justifies both — by the same faith-principle. The OT differentiates the peoples with Israel above all others; Paul places both groups in the same position before the same God on the same basis.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Ex 19:5-6

Now therefore, if you will indeed obey my voice, and keep my covenant, then you shall be my own possession from among all peoples; for all the earth is mine; and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.

1 Cor 12:13

For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all given to drink into one Spirit.

Exodus 19:5-6 establishes Israel as God's "own possession from among all peoples" — the covenant community is formed precisely by distinction from all other peoples. First Corinthians 12:13 forms the covenant community by inclusion of both Jews and Greeks into one body through one Spirit — explicitly crossing the division Exodus 19:5-6 constitutes.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Num 23:9

For from the top of the rocks I see him. From the hills I see him. Behold, a people who dwell alone, and shall not be counted among the nations!

Eph 2:13-14

But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off are made near in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one, and broke down the middle wall of partition,

Numbers 23:9 is the OT's explicit declaration of Israel's apartness: they "dwell alone" and are not counted among the nations — the separation between Israel and the Gentile peoples is structural and divinely decreed. Ephesians 2:13-14 declares that those "far off" have been "made near" and that the "middle wall of partition" has been broken down. The OT declares the partition structural; Paul declares it broken.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Deut 14:2

For you are a holy people to Yahweh your God, and Yahweh has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples who are on the face of the earth.

Eph 2:19

So then you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God,

Deuteronomy 14:2 locates the Gentiles as the "all peoples" above whom Israel is chosen — the Gentiles are the others, the outsiders, who are not God's possession. Ephesians 2:19 addresses Gentiles directly: "you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens." "No longer strangers and foreigners" is the direct negation of the position Deuteronomy 14:2 assigns to non-Israel peoples.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Deut 7:6

Yahweh your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples who are on the face of the earth.

Eph 3:6

that the Gentiles are fellow heirs, and fellow members of the body, and fellow partakers of his promise in Christ Jesus through the Good News,

Deuteronomy 7:6 positions Israel as God's chosen possession above all Gentile peoples — the inheritance of covenant promises belongs to Israel, not the nations. Ephesians 3:6 declares the Gentiles to be “fellow heirs” — sharing in the same inheritance — and “fellow partakers of his promise.” The “fellow-” prefix (συγκληρονόμα, σύσσωμα, συμμετοχα) is the explicit equalisation of what Deuteronomy made differential.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Ps 147:19-20

He shows his word to Jacob, his statutes and his ordinances to Israel. He has not done this for just any nation. They don't know his ordinances.

Col 1:23

if it is so that you continue in the faith, grounded and steadfast, and not moved away from the hope of the Good News which you heard, which is being proclaimed in all creation under heaven; of which I, Paul, was made a servant.

Psalms 147:19-20 specifies that God's revelation is to Jacob/Israel and has not been given to other nations. Colossians 1:23 characterises Paul's commission as proclaiming the Good News “in all creation under heaven” — the scope is the entire inhabited world with no restriction to one people. The OT defines divine revelation as given to Israel alone; Paul describes his commission as universal proclamation to all creation.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Amos 3:2

You only have I known of all the families of the earth. Therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.

Rom 1:5

through whom we received grace and apostleship, for obedience of faith among all the nations, for his name's sake;

Amos 3:2 is the OT's sharpest expression of Israel's exclusive covenantal election: “you only have I known of all the families of the earth.” God's covenant knowing-relationship is exclusively with Israel. Romans 1:5 frames Paul's apostolic commission as producing “obedience of faith among all the nations” — the covenantal response that the OT reserves for Israel's unique relationship with God is now being evoked among all nations.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Num 23:9

Behold, a people who dwell alone, and shall not be counted among the nations!

Rom 1:14

I am debtor both to Greeks and to foreigners, both to the wise and to the foolish.

Numbers 23:9 presents Israel's dwelling-alone and non-counting among the nations as a defining identity. Romans 1:14 declares Paul to be a **debtor** to Greeks and foreigners — the people whom the OT defines as those from whom Israel is separate are the people to whom Paul owes a gospel-obligation.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Ps 147:19-20

He shows his word to Jacob, his statutes and his ordinances to Israel. He has not done this for just any nation.

Gal 1:16

to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I didn't immediately confer with flesh and blood,

Psalms 147:19-20 declares that God revealed his word specifically to Israel — he “has not done this for just any nation.” The Gentiles are precisely the category for whom God's special revelation is not done. Galatians 1:16 states that Paul's calling was to preach the Son “among the Gentiles” — the revelation of the Son is now directed exactly toward the nations Psalm 147 says God has not given revelation to.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Deut 7:6

Yahweh your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples who are on the face of the earth.

Gal 2:7-8

but to the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the Good News for the uncircumcised, even as Peter with the Good News for the circumcised (for he who worked through Peter in the apostleship with the circumcised also worked through me with the Gentiles);

Deuteronomy 7:6 presents God's covenantal relationship as exclusively with Israel. Galatians 2:7-8 declares that the same God who worked through Peter toward the circumcision

also worked through Paul toward the Gentiles — the identical divine agent is active in the Gentile mission. The OT presents God’s special activity as reserved for Israel; Paul presents God’s same apostolic-commissioning work as operating toward Gentile peoples through him.

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Ex 19:5-6

you shall be my own possession from among all peoples... you shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.

Gal 4:4-5

But when the fullness of the time came, God sent out his Son that he might redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of children.

Exodus 19:5-6 restricts the status of kingdom of priests and holy people to Israel — chosen from among all peoples. Adoption into covenant sonship with God is, in the OT framework, Israel’s particular privilege as the chosen nation. Galatians 4:4-5 declares that the purpose of Christ’s sending was universal adoption: “that we might receive the adoption of children” — with “we” in context encompassing both those under the law (Israel) and Gentile believers (cf. 4:8).

Contradiction: The same God cannot choose Israel above all peoples as his exclusive possession and also declare those peoples to be fellow heirs on the same basis. Election above all nations and universal equality before God on identical terms cannot both be authoritative declarations from the same deity.

Slavery and Hierarchy: The Absent Haustafel

The primary antithesis in this chapter is structural. The slave codes and household submission texts (Colossians 3:18–4:1) are absent from this reconstruction, identified as interpolations on Marcionite-absence and structural grounds (see Companion A for the full adjudication). The Old Testament passage they would have harmonised Paul with is presented below, set against the verses that remain. The absence of the Haustafel is not a gap in Paul’s argument — it is Paul’s argument. What the editors added is what Paul did not say.

Lev 25:44–46

As for your male and female slaves whom you may have: you may buy male and female slaves from the nations that are around you... and they will be your property. You may leave them as an inheritance for your children after you, to hold as a possession; of these you may be a slave owner.

Colossians 3:18–4:1 **REM**

Wives, be in subjection to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and don’t be bitter against them. Children, obey your parents in all things, for this pleases the Lord. Fathers, don’t provoke your children, so that they won’t be discouraged. Servants, obey in all things those who are your masters according to the flesh, not just when they are looking, as people-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God. And whatever you do, work heartily, as for the Lord, and not for men, knowing that from the Lord you will receive the reward of the inheritance; for you serve the Lord Christ. But he who does wrong will receive again for the wrong that he has done, and there is no partiality. Masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that you also have a Master in heaven.

The Haustafel codes — wives obey husbands, children obey parents, slaves obey masters (Col 3:18–4:1) — are the primary institutional submission texts in the Pauline corpus. Their absence from Companion B is the structural antithesis of this chapter. Leviticus 25:44–46 legislates hereditary chattel slavery as a permanent institution for non-Israelites, with explicit permission for inter-generational ownership. The canonical text above (marked REM) is what was interpolated; in Companion B this entire passage is absent. Without the Haustafel, Companion B has no slave-submission text and no domestic hierarchy code. What remains is Galatians 3:28 (neither slave nor free) and Galatians 5:1 (stand firm in liberty). The Old Testament institution has no Pauline endorsement in this reconstruction. The editors who inserted the Haustafel were resolving a specific institutional tension; its absence makes that tension visible.

Lev 25:44-46

As for your male and female slaves whom you may have: you may buy male and female slaves from the nations that are around you... They will be your property. You may leave them as an inheritance for your children after you, to hold for a possession. You may have them as slaves forever.

Gal 3:28

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

Leviticus 25:44-46 establishes the legal framework for permanent hereditary slavery: people bought from other nations may be held as property forever and inherited by children. The slave/free distinction is a permanent, property-based, divinely-permitted social structure. Galatians 3:28 explicitly names the slave/free distinction as one of the binary divisions that no longer operates in Christ: “neither slave nor free man.” The legal permanence of the slave/free boundary in Leviticus is precisely what “neither slave nor free” annuls as an operative distinction before God.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Ex 21:2-11

If you buy a Hebrew servant, he shall serve six years and in the seventh he shall go out free... But if the servant shall plainly say, ‘I love my master... I will not go out free;’ then his master shall bring him to God... and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever.

Gal 5:1

Stand firm therefore in the liberty by which Christ has made us free, and don’t be entangled again with a yoke of bondage.

Exodus 21:2-11 establishes a regulated slave system in which permanent servitude is a legal option — the law regulates slavery as a normal institution, even providing for its perpetuation through ear-boring. Galatians 5:1 characterises any re-engagement with “a yoke of bondage” as something believers must resist. While Paul’s immediate referent is law-bondage, the metaphor of the “yoke” deliberately evokes the actual physical institution the OT regulates; the whole logic of slavery-as-normal-institution is what believers have been freed from.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Lev 25:44-46

You may have them as slaves forever, but over your brothers, the children of Israel, you shall not rule, one over another, with harshness.

Gal 4:1-7

But I say that so long as the heir is a child, he is no different from a bondservant, though he is lord of all... So you are no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

Leviticus 25:44-46 establishes slavery as a permanent institution with explicit divine sanction. Galatians 4:1-7 uses the slave/son distinction as a theological metaphor that directly negates the institution's legitimacy: the slave-state is equated with minority and elemental bondage, and the resolution is that believers are "no longer bondservants, but sons." Paul's metaphor depends on and then dismantles the slave/son hierarchy that Leviticus maintains as a permanent legal structure.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Ex 21:20-21

If a man strikes his servant or his maid with a rod, and he dies under his hand, he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he gets up after a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is the man's property.

Philemon 16

no longer as a slave, but more than a slave, a beloved brother—especially to me, but how much rather to you, both in the flesh and in the Lord.

Exodus 21:20-21 classifies the slave explicitly as "the man's property" (literally "his money") — the slave's personhood is legally reduced to property-status, and this legal category governs even the threshold for punishment. Philemon 16 applies Galatians 3:28 to one actual enslaved person, Onesimus: he is "no longer a slave, but more than a slave, a beloved brother." The property-category of Exodus 21 is replaced by the brother-category of the gospel. The chapter opener in Companion B explicitly identifies Philemon as the letter that translates the Gal 3:28 claim into one actual relationship. The antithesis is total: property vs. beloved brother.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Lev 25:44-46

You may buy male and female slaves from the nations that are around you... They will be your property.

1 Cor 7:21-23

Were you called being a bondservant? Don't let that bother you, but if you get an opportunity to become free, use it. For he who was called in the Lord being a bondservant is the Lord's free man... You were bought with a price. Don't become bondservants of men.

Leviticus 25:44-46 establishes that enslaved people from other nations may be permanent property — the slave institution is presented as legitimate and without caveat for the enslaved person. The OT text gives no counsel that the enslaved person should seek freedom; it addresses the slave-owner's rights. First Corinthians 7:21 actively counsels the enslaved person: "if you get an opportunity to become free, use it." This is an explicit exhortation toward freedom, directly contrary to the OT framework.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Deut 15:12-17

If your brother... be sold to you and serves you six years, then in the seventh year you shall let him go free from you... if your servant tells you, 'I will not go out from you'... then you shall take an awl, and put it through his ear to the door, and he shall be your servant forever.

1 Cor 12:13

For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all given to drink into one Spirit.

Deuteronomy 15:12-17 regulates Hebrew servitude, including the provision for permanent slavery through the doorpost ritual — the slave/free distinction is embedded in the Torah as a legal social structure. First Corinthians 12:13 lists "bond or free" alongside "Jews or Greeks" as one of the binary social distinctions that is crossed in the formation of the one body through the one Spirit. The slave/free distinction that Deuteronomy structures and regulates is precisely one of the divisions that Spirit-baptism dissolves.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Prov 8:15-16

By me kings reign, and rulers decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the righteous rulers of the earth.

Eph 6:12

For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world's rulers of the darkness of this age, and against the spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenly places.

Proverbs 8:15-16 grounds earthly hierarchy — kings, rulers, princes, nobles — in divine Wisdom's authority: hierarchy is the right ordering of the earth, underwritten by God's own wisdom. Ephesians 6:12 characterises the opposition in cosmic terms as "principalities," "powers," and "world's rulers of the darkness of this age." The earthly powers that Proverbs presents as wisdom's instruments are reframed as associated with darkness; and this comes immediately after the absent Haustafel (Eph 5:22–6:9 is absent from Companion B — not in the proto-Pauline text Marcion received; later inserted into canonical Ephesians). Without the submission codes, Eph 6:12 stands as the letter's answer to worldly hierarchy: the battle is against its spiritual undergirding, not in submission to it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Ex 21:20-21

Notwithstanding, if he gets up after a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is the man's property.

Col 2:14-15

wiping out the handwriting in ordinances which was against us; and he has taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; having stripped the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

Exodus 21:20-21 is one of the slave-ordinances: the law that classifies the beaten slave as "property" is part of the "handwriting in ordinances." Colossians 2:14-15 declares those ordinances to have been "nailed to the cross" — wiped out and removed. Furthermore, "having stripped the principalities and the powers" — the powers that underwrite social hierarchies including slavery — Paul declares them triumphed over in the cross. The OT's slave-law is one of the ordinances against which Col 2:14-15 is explicitly directed.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Lev 25:44-46

You may have them as slaves forever... They will be your property.

[Col 3:18–4:1 is absent from Companion B
identified as a later insertion not in the Apostolikon Marcion received]

Leviticus 25:44–46 establishes perpetual slavery as a divinely sanctioned institution. The canonical Colossians 3:22 contained the instruction “slaves, obey your masters in everything” — which would have been a direct secondary application of the OT’s slave-institution logic to the Christian community. In this reconstruction, Col 3:18–4:1 is entirely absent from Companion B: identified as a later insertion (mirrors Ephesians’ household code; not present in the Apostolikon Marcion received). The absence creates an antithesis of omission: the text that would have accommodated the OT slave-institution to Christian practice was added by later editors and is not in the proto-Pauline corpus. What remains — Gal 3:28, Col 2:14–15, Philemon 16 — contradicts the OT institution directly.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Ex 21:2–11, Lev 25:44–46

If you buy a Hebrew servant, he shall serve six years... he shall serve him forever... You may have them as slaves forever.

[Eph 5:22–6:9 is absent from Companion B
identified as a later insertion not in the Apostolikon Marcion received]

Exodus 21 and Leviticus 25 together establish the Torah’s slave-institutions. The canonical Ephesians 5:22–6:9 is the most elaborated Haustafel in the Pauline corpus: wives submit to husbands, slaves obey masters as to the Lord (6:5–9). That passage, not present in the Apostolikon Marcion received and identified as a later insertion, is not in Companion B. What remains is Eph 2:14–15 (the law of commandments in ordinances abolished), 3:6 (Gentiles as fellow heirs), and 6:12 (battle against principalities and powers). The absence of the slave-submission code, combined with what remains, creates a letter that structurally undermines rather than reinforces the OT’s slave-institution.

Contradiction: The same God cannot institutionalise slavery and household hierarchy as permanent divine ordinances and also inspire a corpus that declares there is neither slave nor free in Christ, that the slave is to be received as a brother rather than property, and that the household submission codes are absent. These are structurally incompatible positions on the same social institution.

Creation, “This Present Evil Age”, and the Hidden God

Two cosmological antitheses run through Companion B. The first is temporal: the Old Testament’s creation was “very good” (Gen 1:31); Paul describes the present age as evil and from which Christ came to deliver (Gal 1:4). The second is epistemic: the Old Testament’s God speaks face-to-face and reveals plans to prophets (Exod 33:11; Amos 3:7); Paul preaches a God whose wisdom was hidden in a mystery that none of the rulers of this world knew (1 Cor 2:7–8). Colossians 1:15’s retained text — “the image of the invisible God” — places the hiddenness of the Father at the centre of Paul’s Christology. Note that 1 Cor 2:7–8 versus Amos 3:7 is among the most theologically decisive entries in this corpus: Amos declares as a principle that God never acts without revealing the plan to the prophets; Paul says the central plan was hidden from everyone, including, implicitly, the Old Testament prophets.

Creation and the Evil Age

Gen 1:31

God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

Gal 1:4

who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father—

Genesis 1:31 makes an unqualified declaration that the totality of what God made is “very good” — the summative verdict over the entire created order. Galatians 1:4 uses the phrase “this present evil age” (τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ) to characterise the current world-order as evil and frames Christ’s death precisely as deliverance FROM it. The adjective πονηροῦ (evil, wicked) applied to the present age is the categorical opposite of the divine verdict “very good” in Genesis. Gal 1:4 does not say the age became evil or is partly evil — it names the age as such and defines salvation as exit from it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Gen 1:31

God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

Eph 5:16

redeeming the time, because the days are evil.

The OT’s creation narrative culminates in the verdict that everything God made was “very good,” including the order of days (Gen 1:5–31 is structured as a sequence of named days, each receiving divine approval). Ephesians 5:16 characterises the days themselves as evil (αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσιν), requiring believers to “redeem the time” against the grain of their temporal situation. This is not a statement about human conduct but about the quality of the present temporal order. The direct lexical match — “evil” applied to what the OT calls “good” — makes this one of the cleanest antitheses in the corpus.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Ps 19:1

The heavens declare the glory of God. The expanse shows his handiwork.

2 Cor 4:4

in whom the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the Good News of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn on them.

Psalms 19:1 declares that the created cosmos is an unrestricted medium of divine self-disclosure — the heavens actively and continuously declare God’s glory to all observers. Second Corinthians 4:4 introduces a rival sovereign, “the god of this world” (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου), whose specific activity is to blind minds so that the light of God’s glory cannot reach them. Ps 19:1 presents creation as transparent to divine glory; 2 Cor 4:4 presents the present world-order as a domain in which a hostile power systematically prevents exactly that perception.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Gen 1:31

God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

Eph 2:1-2

You were made alive when you were dead in transgressions and sins, in which you once walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit who now works in the children of disobedience;

Genesis 1:31's "very good" verdict encompasses everything — including the air, the sky, and the structuring principles of the world. Ephesians 2:1-2 identifies "the course of this world" as the domain of "the prince of the power of the air" — a hostile spiritual sovereign whose activity constitutes the pre-salvation condition of humanity. The OT creates a world whose every feature reflects divine goodness; Companion B presents the same world as governed by a hostile prince. There is no OT analogue for a sovereign power over the air who opposes God and governs human behaviour.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Ps 19:1

The heavens declare the glory of God. The expanse shows his handiwork.

Eph 6:12

For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world's rulers of the darkness of this age, and against the spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenly places.

Psalm 19:1 presents the heavens as a theatre of divine glory — what is "in the heavenly places" declares God. Ephesians 6:12 states that what is in the heavenly places includes "the world's rulers of the darkness of this age" (τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) and "spiritual forces of wickedness." The phrase "world's rulers of the darkness of this age" precisely inverts Ps 19:1: the heavens are not a site of God's glory-declaration but a habitation of hostile powers opposed to God.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Gen 1:31

God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

Col 1:13

who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of his love;

The OT creation narrative knows no "power of darkness" over humanity as part of the created order — when God surveys his completed creation, his verdict is unqualified approval. Colossians 1:13 presents the prior human condition as subjection to ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους, the authority of darkness, from which deliverance is necessary. The human situation inside God's "very good" creation is, in Companion B, one of enslavement to a hostile power. The contrast is direct: Gen 1:31 says the created order God made was good; Col 1:13 says people required rescue from the power that governed that order.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Ps 104:24

Yahweh, how many are your works! In wisdom have you made them all. The earth is full of your riches.

2 Cor 4:18

while we don’t look at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.

Psalm 104:24 celebrates the visible created world as the expression of God’s wisdom and the repository of his riches — it is the seen things that manifest God’s character and abundance. Second Corinthians 4:18 directly inverts this: the seen things (τὰ βλεπόμενα) are explicitly characterised as temporal (πρόσκαιρα), while the unseen things are eternal (αἰώνια). The OT grounds its theology in the visible creation; Companion B re-grounds it in what is invisible and unseen. The practical instruction is to stop attending to the visible world — directly contrary to Psalm 104’s invitation to attend to it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Ps 104:24

Yahweh, how many are your works! In wisdom have you made them all. The earth is full of your riches.

1 Cor 7:31

and those who use the world, as not using it to the fullest. For the mode of this world passes away.

Psalm 104:24 presents the world as the enduring, wisdom-ordered expression of God’s creative abundance. First Corinthians 7:31 declares that “the mode (σχῆμα) of this world passes away” — the structured shape of the present world-order is transient and not to be fully engaged. The Psalmist invites attention to the world’s richness as a form of praise; Paul instructs disengagement from that same world because it is passing.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Isa 40:28

Haven't you known? Haven't you heard? The everlasting God, Yahweh, the Creator of the ends of the earth, doesn't faint. He isn't weary.

2 Cor 5:1

For we know that if the earthly house of our tent is dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens.

Isaiah 40:28 celebrates Yahweh as the Creator whose creative work is permanent and exhaustless. Second Corinthians 5:1 introduces a stark contrast between the earthly (ἐπίγειος), characterised as a dissolving tent, and the heavenly building “not made with hands, eternal.” The phrase “not made with hands” (ἀχειροποίητος) implicitly categorises the created order — made by God’s hands in creation — as lesser, temporary, and destined for dissolution. The God Isaiah celebrates as the Creator of the earth here has what he creates deprecated as a tent that dissolves.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Gen 1:31

God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

Rom 8:20-22 **SUS**

For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but because of him who subjected it, in hope... For we know that the whole creation groans and travails in pain together until now.

Genesis 1:31’s verdict “very good” is the OT’s unqualified final word on creation as God made it. Romans 8:20-22 declares that creation has been “subjected to vanity” (ματαιότητι), is in “bondage to decay,” and “groans and travails in pain.” These are the diametric opposites of the OT’s creator’s verdict: good/very good vs. subjected to vanity; completed and approved vs. groaning under pain. These verses carry a SUS flag in Companion B; cited with that qualification.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Ps 104:24

Yahweh, how many are your works! In wisdom have you made them all. The earth is full of your riches.

Phil 3:19-20

whose end is destruction, whose god is the belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who think about earthly things. For our citizenship is in heaven, from where we also wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ;

Psalms 104:24 celebrates the earth as full of God’s riches — thinking about earthly things, in OT terms, is attending to what God has made. Philippians 3:19-20 identifies “those who think about earthly things” (τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντας) with enemies of the cross, whose god is their belly and whose end is destruction. “Our citizenship is in heaven” directly contrasts with the OT’s theology of earthly vocation and creation-attentiveness as modes of covenant faithfulness. Phil 3:19 makes thinking about earthly things a marker of the enemies of Christ.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

Gen 1:31

God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.

1 Cor 15:26

The last enemy that will be abolished is death.

Genesis 1:31’s “very good” verdict covers the totality of what God made. First Corinthians 15:26 characterises death as “the last enemy” (ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς) — not a neutral feature of creation but a hostile power that will require active abolition. In the OT framework, death’s existence in the created order is compatible with (or at least not contradicted by) the verdict of “very good.” In Companion B, death is an enemy currently reigning in creation — one that Christ must abolish, not one that God created and approved.

Contradiction: The same God cannot pronounce creation very good and command investment in earthly flourishing, and also inspire the declaration that this present evil age is to be escaped and that the visible created order is temporal and not to be fully engaged. These are incompatible assessments of the same world.

The Hidden God and the Covenant

Ex 33:11

Yahweh spoke to Moses face to face, as a man speaks with his friend.

Col 1:15 (PAR) **PAR**

who is the image of the invisible God.

Exodus 33:11 presents Yahweh as a God who communicates directly and personally — “face to face, as a man speaks with his friend.” The register is maximum visibility and intimacy; Moses knows God as a friend knows a friend. Colossians 1:15 opens its Christ-predication

with “the image of the invisible God” (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου) — God is, by definition, invisible, and Christ is his image precisely because the God behind him cannot be directly seen. The claim that God is invisible directly contradicts Ex 33:11’s account of face-to-face encounter. In Companion B, the retained partial text is exactly this phrase: “who is the image of the invisible God.” — and that phrase alone carries the antithesis.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Amos 3:7

Surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, unless he reveals his secret to his servants the prophets.

Col 1:26

the mystery which has been hidden for ages and generations. But now it has been revealed to his saints,

Amos 3:7 is a principle of the OT prophetic tradition: before God acts, he reveals his purpose to his prophets. The prophets are God’s revelation channel. Colossians 1:26 states that a specific mystery was “hidden for ages and generations” (ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν) and only now revealed. “Ages and generations” encompasses the entire prophetic period of the OT — the exact span during which Amos 3:7 claims God was revealing his secrets to the prophets. The direct contradiction is between Amos’s principle (God reveals before acting) and Colossians’s historical claim (the mystery was hidden throughout that entire era, not revealed through the prophetic channel).

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Isa 45:19

I have not spoken in secret, in a place of the land of darkness. I didn’t say to the offspring of Jacob, ‘Seek me in vain.’ I, Yahweh, speak righteousness. I declare things that are right.

1 Cor 2:7-9

But we speak God’s wisdom in a mystery, the wisdom that has been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds for our glory, which none of the rulers of this world has known... But as it is written, ‘Things which an eye didn’t see, and an ear didn’t hear, which didn’t enter into the heart of man, these God has prepared for those who love him.’

Isaiah 45:19 is an explicit divine denial of concealment: Yahweh did not speak in secret places of darkness; he did not tell Israel to seek him in vain; he speaks righteousness and declares what is right. The entire passage is God's assertion of his own openness and accessibility. First Corinthians 2:7-9 declares that God's wisdom is a "mystery" (μυστήριον) that has been "hidden" (ἀποκεκρυμμένην), and quotes a text about things "an eye didn't see, and an ear didn't hear" as the content of what God has prepared. Isa 45:19 explicitly says God has not spoken in secret; 1 Cor 2:7-9 says the wisdom was hidden and could not be perceived by any human faculty.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Amos 3:7

Surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, unless he reveals his secret to his servants the prophets.

Eph 3:3-5

how that by revelation the mystery was made known to me, as I wrote before in few words, by which, when you read, you can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ; which in other generations was not made known to the children of men, as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit;

Amos 3:7 states that God does not act without revealing his purposes to the prophets. Ephesians 3:5 explicitly states that the mystery of Christ "in other generations was not made known to the children of men" — where "other generations" refers to the OT prophetic period. The temporal contrast directly contradicts Amos 3:7: if God consistently revealed his secrets to the prophets before acting, the mystery could not have remained unknown through those generations. The phrase "not made known to the children of men" (οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων) specifically covers the OT prophetic community.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Isa 45:19

I have not spoken in secret, in a place of the land of darkness.

Eph 3:9 **SUS**

and to make all men see what is the administration of the mystery which for ages has been hidden in God, who created all things through Jesus Christ;

Isaiah 45:19 explicitly denies that God has spoken "in secret, in a place of the land of darkness" — the hidden and the secret are what God denies about his self-communi-

cation. Ephesians 3:9 states that there is a mystery “which for ages has been hidden in God” (ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἐν τῷ θεῷ) — precisely the hidden-in-darkness mode of divine withholding that Isaiah explicitly disclaims. This verse carries a SUS flag; cited with that qualification.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Deut 30:11-14

For this commandment which I command you today is not too hard for you, neither is it far off... But the word is very near you, in your mouth, and in your heart, that you may do it.

Gal 1:11-12

But I make known to you, brothers, concerning the Good News which was preached by me, that it is not according to man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ.

Deuteronomy 30:11-14 is Moses’s explicit assertion that the divine word is not distant or hard — it is “not in heaven” requiring a messenger, “not beyond the sea” requiring an envoy; it is “very near you, in your mouth, and in your heart.” The claim is that revelation of God’s will is already mediated and accessible through the Torah-community; transmission through human teaching is exactly how it reaches each generation. Galatians 1:11-12 directly rejects that mode of transmission: “I received it not from man, nor was I taught it.” For the OT, the word is near through transmitted teaching; Companion B’s gospel came by personal revelation that bypassed all human transmission.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Amos 3:7

Surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, unless he reveals his secret to his servants the prophets.

Gal 1:15-16

But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I didn’t immediately confer with flesh and blood,

Amos 3:7 presents revelation as flowing through an established prophetic channel — God acts by revealing to his servants, the prophets, who are the institutional conduit of divine disclosure. Galatians 1:15-16 presents Paul’s revelation as a direct, bypassing event: God

revealed his Son "in me" (ἐν ἐμοί), and Paul's first response was specifically NOT to confer with flesh and blood — not to go to Jerusalem, not to consult those who were apostles before him. The OT channel (the established prophetic community, the Jerusalem leadership) is explicitly what Paul avoided. Amos says God reveals through the established channel; Paul says his revelation came outside it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Deut 30:11-14

For this commandment which I command you today is not too hard for you, neither is it far off... the word is very near you, in your mouth, and in your heart, that you may do it.

Rom 8:3

For what the law couldn't do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God did, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh;

Deuteronomy 30:11-14 is Moses's explicit assertion that the Torah commandment is achievable: "not too hard for you," "not far off," "very near you... that you may do it" (לֵבְשֶׁהָ). The entire passage is Moses's denial of the law's inaccessibility or impossibility. Romans 8:3 opens with the counter-claim: "For what the law couldn't do (τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου) in that it was weak through the flesh." Deuteronomy says the law is not too hard and is very near so that you can do it; Romans 8:3 says the law was incapable (ἀδύνατον) and weak. These are not different points on the same spectrum — Deuteronomy specifically addresses and denies the concern that the law is too hard; Companion B specifically asserts that incapacity.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Jer 31:33

But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says Yahweh: I will put my law in their inward parts, and I will write it in their heart. I will be their God, and they shall be my people. They shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, 'Know Yahweh'; for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them.

Rom 11:33-35

Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out! For who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counselor?

Jeremiah 31:33 is the classic OT promise of universal and accessible knowledge of God: all shall know Yahweh, from least to greatest, without the need for further teaching. Romans 11:33-35 characterises God's judgments as "unsearchable" (ἀνεξερεύνητα) and his ways as "past tracing out" (ἀνεξιχνίαστοι), then asks rhetorically "who has known the mind of the Lord?" — implying the answer is no one. Jeremiah says all shall know Yahweh; Romans says his ways are past tracing out. Jeremiah promises no more teaching needed because knowledge is direct; Romans implies no one has accessed the divine mind.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Jer 31:33

they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them.

1 Cor 2:16

'For who has known the mind of the Lord, that he should instruct him?' But we have Christ's mind.

Jeremiah 31:33 promises universal knowledge of Yahweh — not mediated by teachers, not restricted to the wise or great, but available to all. First Corinthians 2:16 quotes a rhetorical question — "who has known the mind of the Lord?" — that implies the answer is no one, then immediately restricts access: "But we have Christ's mind." The knowledge of God is not universally accessible through covenant membership, as Jeremiah promises; it is available only through the specific community that "has Christ's mind." The OT promise of universal access is contradicted by Companion B's restriction of access to those who have come through Christ.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Ex 33:11

Yahweh spoke to Moses face to face, as a man speaks with his friend." / Deut 30:11-14 — "the word is very near you, in your mouth, and in your heart, that you may do it.

2 Cor 3:14-16

But their minds were hardened, for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remains, because in Christ it passes away. But to this day,

when Moses is read, a veil lies on their heart. But whenever one turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away.

Exodus 33:11 presents the Mosaic encounter as the paradigm of God's accessible self-communication — face to face, friend to friend, no concealment. Deuteronomy 30:14 insists the word is "very near... in your mouth and in your heart." Both texts present the Torah/Mosaic revelation as transparent and accessible. Second Corinthians 3:14-16 states that "until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remains" — when Moses is read, a veil lies on the heart. Reading the old covenant does not produce the accessibility Deuteronomy promises; it produces concealment. The Torah that the OT presents as near, accessible, and face-to-face, Companion B presents as veiled, concealing, and productive of hardening. Only turning to the Lord (i.e., Christ) removes the veil.

Contradiction: The same God cannot speak openly to his people through law and prophets across centuries and also be the God who was hidden before the ages, unknown even to the rulers of this world, revealed only now through a mystery previously concealed from everyone. Open covenant-making and hiddenness before the ages are not two phases of one plan; they are two incompatible modes of divine existence.

Wisdom and the Rulers

First Corinthians 1–2 constitutes a sustained antithesis to the Old Testament’s theology of wisdom. In Proverbs, wisdom is the highest human attainment and the source of royal authority. In Deuteronomy, the law is Israel’s wisdom — the statutes that will make the nations say “surely this is a wise and understanding people” (Deut 4:6). Paul inverts every element: God has made the world’s wisdom foolish; the rulers who wield it are coming to nothing; the cross — which the Old Testament law calls accursed (Deut 21:23) — is the wisdom of God. This chapter is also where Romans 13:1–7’s absence is most consequential: the rulers Paul says are “coming to nothing” are the same rulers the absent passage would have told believers to obey as ordained by God. The entry for Romans 13:1–7 below is the most structurally revealing connection in this companion.

Deut 4:6-8

Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples, who will hear all these statutes, and say, ‘Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.’

1 Cor 1:21

For seeing that in the wisdom of God, the world through its wisdom didn’t know God, it was God’s good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save those who believe.

Deuteronomy 4:6-8 presents Israel’s wisdom — embodied in the observance of God’s statutes — as both the means of knowing God and the visible evidence of God’s nearness. The claim is that there is a wisdom path to knowing God, accessible through his statutes. First Corinthians 1:21 declares that “the world through its wisdom didn’t know God.” Deut 4:6 says keeping the statutes IS wisdom and knowledge of God; 1 Cor 1:21 says the world’s wisdom, traversed as far as it will go, failed to arrive at God.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Prov 8:15-16

By me kings reign, and rulers decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the righteous rulers of the earth.

1 Cor 1:20

Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the lawyer of this world? Hasn't God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

Proverbs 8:15-16 presents Wisdom as the principle through which rulers, princes, and nobles govern — political authority is properly constituted through and by Wisdom; the wise scribe, the ruler who decrees justice, all operate through divine Wisdom as their medium. First Corinthians 1:20 asks “Where is the wise? Where is the scribe?” — rhetorical questions implying their nullity — and declares that “God has made foolish the wisdom of this world.” Prov 8 says the wise, the scribes, the rulers operate BY wisdom that God supplies; 1 Cor 1:20 says God has made that same wisdom foolish.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Prov 8:15-16

By me kings reign, and rulers decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the righteous rulers of the earth.

1 Cor 1:27-28

but God chose the foolish things of the world that he might put to shame those who are wise. God chose the weak things of the world, that he might put to shame the things that are strong; and God chose the lowly things of the world, and the things that are despised, and the things that are not, that he might bring to nothing the things that are:

Proverbs 8:15-16 presents God's Wisdom as the legitimating principle of the powerful — kings and nobles reign through her. God's Wisdom upholds the governing class. First Corinthians 1:27-28 states that God specifically and deliberately chose the foolish to shame the wise, the weak to shame the strong, the despised to “bring to nothing the things that are.” This is not indifference to the wisdom-power axis but active inversion: God acts to undo precisely the social-cognitive order that Proverbs 8 says operates through his Wisdom.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Prov 8:15-16

By me kings reign, and rulers decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the righteous rulers of the earth.

1 Cor 2:6-8

We speak wisdom, however, among those who are full grown; yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, who are coming to nothing... which none of the rulers of this world has known. For had they known it, they wouldn't have crucified the Lord of glory.

Proverbs 8:15-16 explicitly states that kings reign and rulers decree justice BY Wisdom — they have access to and operate through divine Wisdom as a matter of their legitimate function. First Corinthians 2:6-8 states that “none of the rulers of this world has known” (οὐδείς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν) God's wisdom — and offers the crucifixion of Christ as proof. Proverbs says rulers reign by Wisdom; Companion B says rulers do not know Wisdom and their not-knowing caused them to kill the Lord of glory.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Amos 3:7

Surely the Lord Yahweh will do nothing, unless he reveals his secret to his servants the prophets.

1 Cor 2:7

But we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, the wisdom that has been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds for our glory,

Amos 3:7 presents a principle of consistent divine disclosure through the prophetic channel: God does nothing without revealing it to his prophets. First Corinthians 2:7 states that God's wisdom is “a mystery, the wisdom that has been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds” — hidden through the entire prophetic era, not revealed through the prophets at all. The contrast with Amos 3:7 is direct: Amos says God reveals before acting; Paul says this wisdom was hidden precisely through the prophetic ages that Amos identifies as the revelation period.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Prov 9:10

The fear of Yahweh is the beginning of wisdom. The knowledge of the Holy One is understanding.

1 Cor 3:18-20

Let no one deceive himself. If anyone thinks that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, ‘He has taken the wise in their craftiness.’ And again, ‘The Lord knows the reasoning of the wise, that it is worthless.’

Proverbs 9:10 presents wisdom as the desired attainment of anyone who fears Yahweh — the fear of God is the starting point of wisdom, not its negation. First Corinthians 3:18-20 states that worldly wisdom is “foolishness with God” and that “the reasoning of the wise... is worthless” (μάταιοι εἰσιν). The pathway Proverbs 9:10 opens — from fear of God through wisdom to understanding — is in Companion B a route that leads nowhere useful. One who “thinks he is wise” in Companion B must first “become a fool” before becoming wise — the wisdom Proverbs accumulates is the very thing Paul says to abandon.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Deut 4:6-8

Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples... For what great nation is there, that has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law, which I set before you today?

Col 2:2-3

that their hearts may be comforted, they being knit together in love, and gaining all riches of the full assurance of understanding, that they may know the mystery of God, both of the Father and of Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden.

Deuteronomy 4:6-8 locates wisdom and understanding in the Torah — it is what makes Israel wise in the eyes of the nations; the statutes are the repository of divine wisdom accessible to Israel through their covenant. Colossians 2:2-3 locates “all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως) as hidden in Christ. The word “all” is exclusionary of any other location — all treasures are in Christ, meaning none are available elsewhere, including in the Torah that Deuteronomy identifies as the site of wisdom.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Deut 4:6-8

Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples...

Col 2:8

Be careful that you don't let anyone rob you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the elements of the world, and not after Christ.

Deuteronomy 4:6-8 presents Israel's transmitted tradition — the statutes and ordinances “set before you today” — as the content of their divinely sanctioned wisdom. The tradition is what makes Israel wise. Colossians 2:8 warns against “the tradition of men” (τὴν

παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων) as a vehicle for robbery through vain deceit, contrasting it directly with “after Christ.” The tradition Deuteronomy identifies as God’s gift to Israel is categorised in Companion B as a human tradition operating by the “elements of the world” rather than by Christ.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Prov 8:15-16

By me kings reign, and rulers decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the righteous rulers of the earth.

Eph 6:12

For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world’s rulers of the darkness of this age, and against the spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenly places.

Proverbs 8:15-16 presents the ruling class as exercising their rule through divine Wisdom; they are characterised as “righteous rulers” who operate as Wisdom’s instruments. Ephesians 6:12 identifies the “world’s rulers” (κοσμοκράτορες) as “rulers of the darkness of this age” — agents of darkness, not of Wisdom, against whom believers must wage cosmic warfare. Proverbs 8 says the nobles and princes rule by Wisdom’s authority; Companion B says the world’s rulers are rulers of darkness who are enemies.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

Isa 11:2

The Spirit of Yahweh will rest on him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Yahweh.

2 Cor 10:4-5

for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the throwing down of strongholds, throwing down imaginations and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ;

Isaiah 11:2 presents the Spirit of Yahweh as the source of wisdom, understanding, counsel, and knowledge for the ideal ruler — the Spirit of wisdom legitimates and constitutes proper governance. Second Corinthians 10:4-5 identifies “every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God” as a stronghold to be thrown down, and links this to systems of thought (λογισμούς — reasonings, imaginations). What Isaiah presents as Spirit-given wisdom that structures legitimate rule, Companion B characterises as a category of “high

things” that must be demolished because they resist the knowledge of God as it comes through Christ.

Contradiction: The same God cannot present Torah-wisdom as the highest mode of knowing him and also declare that the world through its wisdom did not know God and that God has made that wisdom foolish. If wisdom-through-Torah was the genuine path to knowing God, it cannot simultaneously be the mode by which the world failed to find him.

The Absent Romans 13:1–7

Prov 8:15-16

By me kings reign, and rulers decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the righteous rulers of the earth.” Also: Jer 27:5-6 — “I have made the earth, the man and the animal that are on the surface of the earth, by my great power and by my outstretched arm; and I give it to whom it seems right to me. Now I have given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant.

Romans 13:1-7 **REM**

“Let every soul be in subjection to the higher authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those who exist are ordained by God. Therefore he who resists the authority withstands the ordinance of God; and those who withstand will receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. Do you desire to have no fear of the authority? Do that which is good, and you will have praise from the same, for he is a servant of God to you for good. But if you do that which is evil, be afraid, for he doesn’t bear the sword in vain; for he is a servant of God, an avenger for wrath to him who does evil. Therefore you need to be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience’s sake. For this reason you also pay taxes, for they are servants of God’s service, attending continually on this very thing. Pay to everyone what you owe: taxes to whom taxes are due; customs to whom customs; respect to whom respect; honor to whom honor.”

Romans 13:1-7 argued that every governing authority is ordained by God, that resisting such authority is resisting God, that rulers are God’s servants for the good of the governed — a position that directly harmonised with the OT’s theology of legitimate kingship (the Davidic covenant, prophetic endorsement of rulers, Proverbs’ claim that kings reign by Wisdom). Without those seven verses, Companion B’s account of human political authority is almost entirely negative: 1 Cor 2:6-8 says the rulers of this world are “coming to nothing” and crucified the Lord; 1 Cor 6:1-7 discourages recourse to civil courts, calling them “the unrighteous”; Eph 6:12 identifies “the world’s rulers of the darkness of this age” as the enemies Christians wrestle against; 2 Cor 10:4-5 speaks of throwing down “every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God.” In canonical Paul, Romans 13:1-7 provided the counter-weight that prevented these passages from becoming a theology of political resistance; without it, Companion B’s world-rulers are either coming to nothing or rulers of darkness. The OT Davidic covenant theology, Jeremiah’s vision of God-ordained rule, and Proverbs’ Wisdom-through-rulers framework have no Pauline bridge into this corpus. The editors who inserted Rom 13:1-7 into canonical Paul supplied the Pauline

endorsement of OT political theology that Companion B lacks; without that insertion, Companion B's account of worldly authority leaves passages characterising rulers as darkness and coming-to-nothing without any counter-weight.

Dietary Law, Sabbath, and Purity Codes

Three Companion B passages engage the Old Testament's purity architecture directly. Colossians 2:16 dismisses food, drink, feast days, new moons, and Sabbaths as shadows. Colossians 2:22 calls the "don't handle, don't taste, don't touch" commandments "precepts and doctrines of men" — when those commandments are God speaking directly to Moses in Leviticus. Galatians 4:9–11 calls the Galatians' observance of calendar days a return to "weak and miserable elemental principles." The Old Testament calls the Sabbath an eternal covenant sign between God and Israel (Exod 31:13–17). The contrast is not between different interpretations of the same law; it is between a law that is binding forever and a set of practices Paul calls shadows at best and elemental bondage at worst.

Ex 31:13-17

You shall observe my Sabbaths... Whoever does any work on the Sabbath day shall surely be put to death. The children of Israel shall observe the Sabbath, to keep it throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant.

Col 2:16-17

Let no one therefore judge you in eating, or in drinking, or with respect to a feast day or a new moon or a Sabbath day, which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's.

Exodus 31:13-17 establishes Sabbath observance as a "perpetual covenant" (בְּרִית עוֹלָם) and the sign of the Sinai covenant — not optional, not provisional, but permanent and identity-constituting, backed by the death penalty. Colossians 2:16-17 declares that the Sabbath, along with feast days and new moons, is "a shadow of the things to come" whose substance belongs to Christ, and explicitly forbids any judgment of believers over Sabbath observance. The OT makes Sabbath non-negotiable and backed by lethal enforcement; Companion B removes all normative force from Sabbath observance and recharacterises it as a shadow.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Lev 11:47

to make a distinction between the unclean animal and the clean, and between the living thing that may be eaten and the living thing that may not be eaten.

Col 2:20-22

If you died with Christ from the elements of the world, why, as though living in the world, do you subject yourselves to ordinances, ‘Don’t handle, nor taste, nor touch’ (all of which perish with use), according to the precepts and doctrines of men?

Leviticus 11:47 presents the food-purity distinction as a divine institution — a line God has drawn between clean and unclean. Colossians 2:20-22 characterises the identical category of touch-and-taste-and-handle prohibitions as: (a) “elements of the world” that believers have died from; (b) ordinances one should no longer subject oneself to; (c) “precepts and doctrines of men.” The OT explicitly attributes the clean/unclean distinction to God as divine legislation; Companion B dismisses the same category of regulations as human-origin precepts that “perish with use.”

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Ex 20:8-11

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. You shall labor six days, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to Yahweh your God... For in six days Yahweh made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; therefore Yahweh blessed the Sabbath day, and made it holy.

Gal 4:9-10

But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, why do you turn back again to the weak and miserable elemental principles, to which you desire to be in bondage all over again? You observe days, months, seasons, and years.

Exodus 20:8-11 grounds Sabbath observance in the character of God himself — it is a participation in the divine rest-pattern of creation, instituted because Yahweh himself hallowed the day. Galatians 4:9-10 characterises the observation of “days, months, seasons, and years” as turning back to “weak and miserable elemental principles” (ἀσθενῇ καὶ πτωχᾷ στοιχείᾳ) — as a form of bondage to pre-knowledge slavery. The OT calls Sabbath the commemoration of God’s creational activity; Companion B calls the same calendar-keeping “weak and miserable.”

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Lev 11:4-8

Nevertheless these you shall not eat... the pig... is unclean to you.

Rom 14:14

I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself; except that to him who considers anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

Leviticus 11:4-8 establishes categorical, objective uncleanness for specific animals — the pig, the camel, the hare, and others are declared unclean not by any individual's assessment but by divine decree. Romans 14:14 directly contradicts this: "nothing is unclean of itself" (οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ). The OT declares specific objects objectively and categorically unclean; Companion B declares no object intrinsically unclean. The only remaining qualification in Rom 14:14 is subjective — something is unclean only "to him who considers it unclean," transforming the OT's objective divine decree into individual conscience.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Lev 11:47

to make a distinction between the unclean animal and the clean, and between the living thing that may be eaten and the living thing that may not be eaten.

Rom 14:20

Don't overthrow God's work for food's sake. All things indeed are clean, however it is evil for that man who creates a stumbling block by eating.

Leviticus 11:47 presents the clean/unclean distinction as a divinely instituted category requiring maintenance. Romans 14:20 states "All things indeed are clean" (πάντα μὲν καθάρᾳ) — a universal statement that erases the categorical distinction Lev 11:47 establishes. The one qualification Companion B offers is entirely social (causing a brother to stumble), not ritual or ontological. The OT says: maintain the distinction; Companion B says: the distinction does not exist.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Deut 14:3

You shall not eat any abominable thing.

1 Cor 10:25

Whatever is sold in the butcher shop, eat, asking no question for the sake of conscience,

Deuteronomy 14:3 issues a categorical prohibition against eating “any abominable thing” (פְּלִיחוֹעֵבָה) — the term covers the entire dietary law system that follows. The operative principle is: ask before you eat, know what you are eating, refuse what is prohibited. First Corinthians 10:25 issues the direct opposite instruction: eat whatever is sold in the market, “asking no question for the sake of conscience.” The phrase “asking no question” (μὴ δὲν ἀνακρίνοντες) specifically describes the suspension of the investigative diligence that Deuteronomy’s dietary law requires.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Ex 31:13-17

You shall observe my Sabbaths... Whoever does any work on the Sabbath day shall surely be put to death.

Rom 14:5-6

One man esteems one day as more important. Another esteems every day alike. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind. He who observes the day, observes it to the Lord; and he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe it.

Exodus 31:13-17 is the most emphatic Sabbath text in the Torah: Sabbath is a “perpetual covenant,” a sign between God and Israel “throughout your generations,” violation of which carries the death penalty. Romans 14:5-6 explicitly frames Sabbath observance as equally valid in either direction: both observance and non-observance are presented as acceptable before God. This is a direct and total contradiction: Ex 31 makes non-observance a capital offense; Rom 14 makes it a valid spiritual posture.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Lev 17:11

For the life of the flesh is in the blood. I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life.

1 Cor 8:8

But food will not commend us to God. For neither, if we don’t eat, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better.

Leviticus 17:11 explicitly grounds the food law (blood prohibition) in its soteriological function — blood makes atonement; therefore food distinctions are not indifferent but constitutive of the mechanism of right relationship with God. First Corinthians 8:8 declares that food is entirely indifferent to one's standing before God: not eating makes you no worse; eating makes you no better. The OT asserts that specific food practices are integral to atonement; Companion B asserts food has zero bearing on standing before God.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Lev 11:44-45

For I am Yahweh your God. Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy... For I am Yahweh who brought you up out of the land of Egypt to be your God. You shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.

1 Cor 6:12-13

All things are lawful for me, but not all things are profitable. All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of anything. Foods for the belly, and the belly for foods; but God will bring to nothing both it and them.

Leviticus 11:44-45 is the theological foundation of the entire purity code: the dietary laws, the clean/unclean animal distinctions, the purity regulations — all are grounded in the holiness of God himself. “Be holy, for I am holy” makes purity observance ontologically derived from divine character. Any violation of the code is an implicit contradiction of the nature of the deity. First Corinthians 6:12 issues the precise opposite as a governing principle: “All things are lawful for me” (πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν) — a universal statement of permissibility with no categorical exceptions. The qualifying clause (“not all things are profitable”) is practical, not legal: nothing is forbidden, though not everything is beneficial. The following verse goes further: “God will bring to nothing both it and them” — Paul attributes the eschatological abolition of the entire food-classification system to God himself. The OT says God's character demands purity through food distinctions; Companion B says God himself is abolishing the food-distinction system. In Companion B, 1 Cor 6:12-13 is uncontested; it stands as the most concentrated statement of universal permissibility in the Pauline corpus.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

Lev 20:24-26

I am Yahweh your God, who has separated you from the peoples. You shall therefore separate the clean animal from the unclean, and the unclean bird from the clean... You

shall be holy to me; for I, Yahweh, am holy, and have set you apart from the peoples, that you should be mine.

Rom 14:17

for God's Kingdom is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.

Leviticus 20:24-26 makes the food-separation law structurally equivalent to Israel's separation from the nations: God has separated clean animals from unclean in the same act by which he separated Israel from the peoples. Food purity is not an incidental obligation but the visible symbol of covenant membership. The clean/unclean distinction in the kitchen mirrors the holy/unholy distinction between Israel and the Gentiles. Romans 14:17 explicitly removes eating and drinking from the category of things that constitute the Kingdom of God: "God's Kingdom is not eating and drinking" (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις). The Kingdom's essence is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit — not the dietary categories the OT uses to define covenant identity. In Companion B, Romans 14 is present in full (Romans 13:1–7 is identified as a later interpolation and is therefore excluded from Companion B); Romans 14:17 stands as an explicit redefinition of what the Kingdom is not, in terms drawn directly from the OT's covenant-identity architecture.

Contradiction: The same God cannot legislate dietary laws and Sabbath observance as eternal covenant obligations backed by the death penalty, and also declare them to be shadows, weak miserable principles, and matters of complete individual indifference. Eternal covenant obligations do not become optional. The character of the God who commanded them would have to have changed fundamentally.

The Sacrificial System and Grace

The Old Testament's sacrificial system is detailed, mandatory, and atoning: Leviticus legislates animal sacrifice as the mechanism by which sin is covered, guilt transferred, and covenant relationship restored. Paul's treatment of sacrifice in the Apostolikon is consistently typological-replacement rather than fulfilment: the Passover lamb is superseded by Christ (1 Cor 5:7); the cross makes the old atoning system redundant; grace operates through what the law's sacrificial economy could not achieve. The antithesis here is not that Paul rejects sacrifice but that the mechanism he describes operates entirely outside the Old Testament's cultic framework.

Ex 12:14

This day shall be a memorial for you. You shall keep it as a feast to Yahweh. You shall keep it as a feast by an ordinance forever.

1 Cor 5:7

Purge out the old yeast, that you may be a new lump, even as you are unleavened. For indeed Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed in our place.

Exodus 12:14 establishes the Passover as a perpetual annual memorial observance — “an ordinance forever” (חֻקַּת עֲלֵדִים) — binding on Israel through all generations. The repetition is mandatory: it is not a once-for-all event but a permanently recurring ritual. First Corinthians 5:7 declares that “Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed” — a single past event stated in the perfect tense (ἐτύθη), which terminates the annual ritual by replacing it with the singular act. The OT mandates perpetual repetition; Companion B declares the singular sacrifice that fulfils and ends the need for repetition.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system's own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God's provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 17:11

For the life of the flesh is in the blood. I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life.

2 Cor 5:14-15

we judge thus, that one died for all, therefore all died. He died for all, that those who live should no longer live to themselves, but to him who for their sakes died and rose again.

Leviticus 17:11 establishes the sacrificial mechanism as ongoing, plural, and altar-based: blood sacrifices are given to Israel for use on the altar across the generations to make atonement. The mechanism is designed for repeated application — “your souls” (plural, ongoing) require ongoing atonement. Second Corinthians 5:14 makes the claim “one died for all” (εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν) — the singularity (εἷς) is the entire point. One act covers all, removing the need for the ongoing plural mechanism Leviticus establishes.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 4:20

He shall do with the young bull as he did with the bull of the sin offering. He shall do the same. The priest shall make atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven.

2 Cor 5:18-19

But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Jesus Christ, and gave to us the ministry of reconciliation; namely, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not reckoning to them their trespasses, and having committed to us the word of reconciliation.

Leviticus 4:20 specifies the mechanism of forgiveness precisely: the priest performs the ritual, and only then “they shall be forgiven” — forgiveness requires priestly mediation and the performance of the prescribed sacrifice. Second Corinthians 5:19 declares that God in Christ was “not reckoning to them their trespasses” (μὴ λογίζομενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα) — God simply not counting transgressions against people. This bypasses the entire Levitical mechanism: no priest, no prescribed animal, no ritual — forgiveness is accomplished through God’s own unilateral decision “not to reckon.”

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 17:11

For the life of the flesh is in the blood. I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life.

Gal 3:13

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us. For it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree,’

Leviticus 17:11 specifies the sacrificial mechanism: an acceptable blood offering on the altar atones for souls. The logic is that the sacrificed animal is accepted, clean, properly presented through the priestly system. Galatians 3:13 states that Christ became a curse (κατάρα) — not an accepted offering but the thing under divine curse. Deuteronomy 21:23 (quoted in Gal 3:13) says that one hanging on a tree is “cursed by God” — precisely the category the OT’s sacrificial system would exclude. Companion B therefore does not simply refine the sacrificial system but overturns its logic by making what is cursed the means of atonement.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 4:20

The priest shall make atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven.

Rom 5:6-10

For while we were yet weak, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly... being now justified by his blood, we will be saved from God’s wrath through him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son...

Leviticus 4’s atonement system operates on those who come to the altar — participants within the covenant system who present the required sacrifice. The ungodly, the enemies of God, the explicitly unqualified, are not its addressees. Romans 5:6-10 makes the unqualified status of the beneficiaries the theological point: Christ died for the “weak,” the “ungodly,” “sinners,” “enemies.” The OT’s sacrificial mechanism requires the right offering, the right procedure, the right participant; Companion B’s mechanism operates precisely on those who have no claim on it.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 4:20

The priest shall make atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven.

Eph 1:7

in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace,

Leviticus 4:20 specifies that forgiveness occurs through priestly mediation — “the priest shall make atonement... and they shall be forgiven.” The priest is the agent; forgiveness depends on the priest’s performance of the prescribed rite. Ephesians 1:7 attributes redemption and the forgiveness of trespasses entirely to Christ’s blood, “according to the riches of his grace” — grace, not priestly performance, is the operative category. No priest, no ritual, no altar is mentioned. Forgiveness belongs to the category of grace (χάρις), which is by definition unearned and not procedurally mediated.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 17:11

I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls.

Col 1:20

and through him to reconcile all things to himself, by him, whether things on the earth, or things in the heavens.

Leviticus 17:11 is explicit about the scope and mechanism of blood sacrifice: it atones for “your souls” — human beings within the covenant community, through the altar. The scope is bounded (covenant Israel), the mechanism is specified (the altar), and the object is defined (human souls). Colossians 1:20 declares that the blood of the cross reconciles “all things” (τὰ πάντα) — things on earth and things in the heavens. The OT sacrificial mechanism was designed for individual human atonement within a specific institutional context; Companion B extends the single sacrificial event to cosmic reconciliation.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 17:11

For the life of the flesh is in the blood. I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls.

2 Cor 3:7-9

But if the service of death, written engraved on stones, came with glory... For if the service of condemnation has glory, the service of righteousness exceeds much more in glory.

Leviticus 17:11 presents the blood sacrifice system in positive terms as God’s own provision — “I have given it to you” — for atonement. The sacrificial system is a divine gift enabling right relationship with God. Second Corinthians 3:7-9 describes the covenant that encompasses this sacrificial system as the “service of death” and the “service of condemnation.”

The OT explicitly frames the blood sacrifice as atonement — a covering, a making-right; Companion B explicitly frames the old covenant ministry as producing death and condemnation.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system's own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God's provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 1:4

He shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.

Gal 2:20

I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me. That life which I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.

Leviticus 1:4 specifies individual participation in atonement: the worshipper lays his own hand on the offering, identifies with it, and the sacrifice is accepted for him. The worshipper is active, the mechanism is procedural, the priest mediates. Galatians 2:20's construction "the Son of God... gave himself up for me" (τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ) inverts every element: the Son, not the worshipper, is the active party; the motivation is love, not procedure; there is no worshipper's hand, no priest, no altar. The OT's activity from the worshipper's side is replaced by self-giving entirely from the divine side.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system's own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God's provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Lev 16:2

Tell Aaron your brother not to enter into the holy place within the veil before the mercy seat which is on the ark at just any time, lest he die; for I will appear in the cloud on the mercy seat." + Lev 16:34 — *"This shall be an everlasting statute for you, to make atonement for the children of Israel once in the year.*

Rom 5:2

through whom we also have access by faith into this grace in which we stand

Leviticus 16 is the foundational access text of the OT: even the High Priest cannot enter the Most Holy Place at will — only once a year (Lev 16:34), only after elaborate preparatory ritual, under pain of death for any unauthorized approach (Lev 16:2). Access to God's presence is the most restricted privilege in Israel's entire cultic system, tiered, procedural, and lethal for violations. Romans 5:2 uses the Greek term προσαγωγή — a technical term

for the right of approach to a royal or divine presence, used in secular Greek for the privileged access of those authorized to present themselves to a king — and attributes this access to “faith” without any procedural qualifier. Every element of the Levitical access system is absent: no High Priest, no once-a-year restriction, no prescribed ritual preparation, no death penalty for unauthorized approach. The OT makes divine presence the most guarded location in Israel; Paul grants direct and continuous access to all who have faith. In Companion B, Romans 5:1-11 is present intact and is the theological centre of the letter’s argument about justification.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

Exod 25:8

Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.” + 1 Kings 8:13 — “I have surely built you a house to dwell in, a settled place for you to abide in forever.

1 Cor 3:16

Don’t you know that you are a temple of God, and that God’s Spirit lives in you?“ + 1 Cor 6:19 — “Or don’t you know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which you have from God?

Exodus 25:8 is God’s command for the construction of the tabernacle, and 1 Kings 8:13 is Solomon’s declaration that the Temple is God’s permanent dwelling. The entire sacrificial system of the OT is spatially premised on this structure: God’s presence is localized in a specific consecrated building; access to that presence requires approaching the building through prescribed channels; sacrifice requires an altar in that location. Paul twice declares that the human body — each believer’s physical body — is God’s temple and the locus of the Holy Spirit’s dwelling. If God’s presence resides in the believer’s body rather than in a consecrated building, the spatial infrastructure on which the sacrificial system depends has no theological foundation. You cannot require an altar, a priest, and an approach procedure when the deity’s dwelling has moved to an interior location that requires no physical approach. In Companion B, both 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19 are uncontested; the community-as-temple and body-as-temple declarations stand as a structural relocation of divine presence from institutional space to human interiority.

Contradiction: The same God cannot establish an elaborate sacrificial system as the necessary and sufficient mechanism for atonement and also render that system redundant through a single act that operates entirely outside the system’s own procedures. If the sacrificial system was genuinely God’s provision, its replacement requires an explanation the text does not provide. If grace operates without it, the system was never necessary.

The Absent Passages: What the Editors Were Answering

The entries in this chapter show the canonical text of each interpolated passage (marked REM in a red border) alongside the Old Testament text it was inserted to harmonise Paul with. The REM block is what later editors added to the Pauline corpus; it is not in Companion B because it was not in the proto-Pauline text Marcion received. Each entry then explains what Old Testament tension the insertion was resolving, and what that tension looks like in its absence. These are the most structurally important entries in this companion: they show that the editors knew precisely what they were doing, and what they were answering.

Gen 15:6

He believed in Yahweh, who credited it to him for righteousness.” Also: Gen 12:3 — “In you all the families of the earth will be blessed.” And Gen 26:5 — “because Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my requirements, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.

Galatians 3:6-9 **REM**

“Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know therefore that those who are of faith, the same are children of Abraham. The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Good News beforehand to Abraham, saying, ‘In you all the nations will be blessed.’ So then, those who are of faith are blessed with the faithful Abraham.”

Galatians 3:6-9 in canonical Paul performed a specific and essential theological function: it grounded the Gentile gospel of faith-righteousness in the Abrahamic precedent, making Gen 15:6 the OT warrant for uncircumcised faith and making Abraham the “father of many nations” the ancestor of Gentile believers. Without it, the argument in Galatians 3 moves from “Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law?” (3:2-5) directly to “as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse” (3:10) — with no OT genealogy connecting the two. What the absence of this later insertion produces is a gospel of grace that arrives in the world without ancestry: the Galatian community has no OT father of faith to appeal to. The retained Gal 3:22 says “the Scriptures imprisoned all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe” — but the identity of the OT promise and its human genealogy are absent, leaving the promise as something that arrives from outside the covenant history. Gen 15:6’s “credited as righteousness” was the OT’s own internal evidence that faith-righteousness predated Torah; without Gal 3:6-9, Companion B’s gospel has no internal OT witness for itself. The editors’ insertion of the Abrahamic chain into canonical Paul supplied a genealogy the proto-Pauline text lacked; without that insertion, the gospel is a genuinely new thing with no prior OT witness rather

than a fulfilment of Abraham's own experience. This is precisely what Marcion argued, because it is what his received text showed.

Gen 15:6

He believed in Yahweh, who credited it to him for righteousness.“ Also Gen 17:10-14 — “*This is my covenant, which you shall keep... Every male among you shall be circumcised.*” And Ps 32:1-2 (quoted in Rom 4:7-8) — “*Blessed is he whose disobedience is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom Yahweh doesn't impute iniquity.*

Romans 4 (the circumcision/Abraham argument in its entirety) REM

“What then will we say that Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh, has found? For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about, but not toward God. For what does the Scripture say? ‘Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.’ Now to him who works, the reward is not counted as grace, but as debt. But to him who doesn't work, but believes in him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is accounted for righteousness. Even as David also pronounces blessing on the man to whom God counts righteousness apart from works, ‘Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.’ Is this blessing then pronounced on the circumcised, or on the uncircumcised also? For we say that faith was accounted to Abraham for righteousness. How then was it counted? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision, that he might be the father of all those who believe, though they might be in uncircumcision, that righteousness might also be accounted to them. He is the father of circumcision to those who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had in uncircumcision. For the promise to Abraham and to his offspring that he should be heir of the world wasn't through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if those who are of the law are heirs, faith is made void, and the promise is made of no effect. For the law works wrath, for where there is no law, neither is there disobedience. For this reason it is of faith, that it may be according to grace, to the end that the promise may be sure to all the offspring, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all. As it is written, ‘I have made you a father of many nations.’ This is in the presence of him whom he believed: God, who gives life to the dead, and calls the things that are not, as though they were. Against hope, Abraham in hope believed, to the end that he might become a father of many nations, according to that which had been spoken, ‘So will your offspring be.’ Without being weakened in faith, he didn't consider his own body, already having been worn out (he being about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb. Yet, looking to the promise of God, he didn't waver through unbelief, but grew strong through faith, giving glory to God, and being fully assured that what he had promised, he was also able to perform. Therefore it also was ‘credited to him for righteousness.’ Now it was

not written that it was accounted to him for his sake alone, but for our sake also, to whom it will be accounted, who believe in him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.”

Romans 4 was the most technically precise OT argument in the Pauline corpus: it argued that Abraham’s faith was credited as righteousness (Gen 15:6) before circumcision was instituted (Gen 17), making Abraham simultaneously the ancestor of circumcised believers AND uncircumcised faith-believers. This was the only place in the corpus where Companion B’s central claim — that the uncircumcised are legitimate heirs of God’s promise — had explicit OT grounding in the chronological sequence of Abraham’s biography. Without Romans 4, what remains in Companion B about circumcision is: Gal 5:2 (if you receive circumcision, Christ profits you nothing); Gal 5:6 (neither circumcision nor uncircumcision matters); Gal 6:15 (neither is anything, but a new creation); Phil 3:3 (we are the circumcision who worship in the Spirit); Col 2:11 (circumcision not made with hands). These passages declare circumcision irrelevant or abolished, but none offers the OT precedent that Romans 4 provided. The claim that uncircumcised faith is heir to the covenant now sits in Companion B as a bare assertion — significant, but without OT grounding. In a debate with a Torah-observant opponent, Companion B can assert faith-righteousness but cannot argue it from the Abraham narrative within the OT’s own covenant structure.

The entire Deuteronomic covenant structure (Deut 30:1-10 *return and restoration of Israel*); Isa 40-55 (*the servant theology and Israel’s ultimate vindication*); Jer 31:31-34 (*new covenant with Israel*); the prophetic promise structure of Hosea, Ezekiel, and the Psalms. Romans 9:25-26 quoted Hosea; 9:27-29 quoted Isaiah; 10:19-21 quoted Deuteronomy and Isaiah; 11:26-27 quoted Isaiah’s redemption oracle — these were the OT’s promises to ethnic Israel, and Romans 9-11 was where Paul resolved their status in the light of the gospel.

Romans 9-11 (the Israel election argument, the olive tree allegory, the remnant theology, the hardening-and-restoration arc — ninety verses reduced to three fragments) REM

“I tell the truth in Christ. I am not lying, my conscience testifying with me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brothers’ sake, my relatives according to the flesh, who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the service, and the promises; of whom are the fathers, and from whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God, blessed forever. Amen. ... As it is written, ‘Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.’ What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? May it never be! For he said to Moses, ‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.’ So then it is not of him who wills, nor of him who runs, but of God who has mercy. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, ‘For this very purpose I caused you to be raised up, that I might show in you my power, and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.’ So then, he has mercy on whom he desires, and he hardens whom he desires. ... including us, whom he also called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles? As he says also in Hosea, ‘I will call them “my

people,” which were not my people; and her “beloved,” who was not beloved.’ ‘It will be that in the place where it was said to them, “You are not my people,” there they will be called “children of the living God.”’ ... I ask then, did God reject his people? May it never be! For I also am an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God didn’t reject his people, which he foreknew. ... I ask then, did they stumble that they might fall? May it never be! But by their fall, salvation has come to the Gentiles, to provoke them to jealousy. Now if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fullness? ... For I don’t desire you to be ignorant, brothers, of this mystery, so that you won’t be wise in your own conceits, that a partial hardening has happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in, and so all Israel will be saved. Even as it is written, ‘There will come out of Zion the Deliverer, and he will turn away ungodliness from Jacob. This is my covenant with them, when I will take away their sins.’ Concerning the Good News, they are enemies for your sake. But concerning the election, they are beloved for the fathers’ sake. For the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable.”

What remains of Romans 9-11 in Companion B is three fragments: 9:1-3 (Paul’s anguish for his people), 10:1-4 (their zeal without knowledge; Christ as the telos of the law), and 11:33-35 (the closing doxology of unsearchable judgments). The architecture — God has not rejected his people; there is a remnant; Israel’s hardening is instrumental; all Israel will be saved; the Gentile mission is grafted into Israel’s olive tree — is entirely absent. This leaves the OT’s covenant with Israel in the most radical possible unresolved state: Deuteronomy’s covenantal blessings and curses, Isaiah’s servant theology, Jeremiah’s new covenant — all promised to ethnic Israel — have no resolution in Companion B. The tension is compounded: Rom 10:4 (retained) says “Christ is the fulfillment/termination of the law” — but without 10:5-21 and without chapters 9 and 11, there is no account of what this means for the people to whom the law was given. The OT promises simply hang over Companion B as an unanswered challenge. By inserting Romans 9–11 into canonical Paul, later editors addressed the entire OT prophetic covenant-promise architecture — an architecture the proto-Pauline text Marcion received left completely unresolved. That is perhaps the most consequential single insertion in the corpus.

Deut 6:24-25

Yahweh commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear Yahweh our God, for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as it is today. It shall be righteousness for us, if we observe to do all this commandment before Yahweh our God, as he has commanded us.” Also Ps 19:7-8 — “Yahweh’s law is perfect, restoring the soul... Yahweh’s precepts are right, rejoicing the heart.

Galatians 3:15-25 (with the exception of 3:22, which is retained as a confirmed Marcionite verse)

REM

“Brothers, speaking of human terms: though it is only a man’s covenant, yet when it has been confirmed, no one makes it void, or adds to it. Now the promises were spoken to Abraham and to his offspring. He doesn’t say, ‘To descendants,’ as of many, but as of one, ‘To your offspring,’ which is Christ. Now I say this: A covenant

confirmed beforehand by God in Christ, the law, which came four hundred thirty years after, does not annul, so as to make the promise of no effect. For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no more of promise; but God has granted it to Abraham by promise. What then is the law? It was added because of transgressions, until the offspring should come to whom the promise has been made. It was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not between one, but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? May it never be! For if there had been a law given which could make alive, most certainly righteousness would have been of the law. ... But before faith came, we were kept in custody under the law, confined for the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So the law has become our guardian to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. Now that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian."

Galatians 3:15-25 provided the developmental theological explanation for why God gave the law if it was not the path to righteousness: the law was a *παιδαγωγός* (guardian/custodian) that held Israel in trust until Christ came, at which point its custodial role ended. This framework preserved the law's divine origin while accounting for its supersession — the law was not wrong, not evil, but preparatory; it served a purpose within the economy of salvation and was then properly set aside. Without it, the sequence in Galatians 3 is: law brings curse (3:10-13) → Christ redeemed from curse (3:13) → the promise of the Spirit through faith (3:14 PAR) → the Scriptures imprisoned all things under sin (3:22, retained) → you are children of God through faith (3:26-28). The retained verse 3:22, which says "the Scriptures imprisoned all things under sin," now operates without any mitigating explanatory frame: the law imprisoned; Christ released; there is no developmental account of why the imprisonment was divinely ordained or what good purpose it served. Deuteronomy 6:24-25 says the law is "our righteousness" and God's gift for Israel's life; Galatians 3:10 (retained) says the law brings a curse; and there is now no passage in Companion B that explains how both can be true. The law is simply a curse with no redemptive past. On the series' thesis, Gal 3:15-25 was not in the proto-Pauline text Marcion received — ancient editors inserted it precisely because without it Galatians 3 reads as a flat rejection of Torah with no developmental account of God's intent. The insertion prevented Gal 3 from collapsing into a naked antithesis; its absence from Companion B is what exposes the collapse. Without Gal 3:15-25, Companion B has no developmental theology — only a before (law, curse, prison) and an after (faith, freedom, children of God), with no account of God's own intent in the before-period.

Conclusion: What the Antitheses Reveal

The Pattern

Every interpolation identified in Companion A moved Paul toward Old Testament continuity, covenant affirmation, and institutional hierarchy. This companion shows what Paul looks like without those additions. The antitheses run in the same direction across every letter, every theme, and every theological category examined. That consistency is the finding.

The law that was a curse became developmental theology (Gal 3:15–25, absent). The God whose unconditional love preceded any action by the recipient became a God whose authority structure was endorsed by Paul (Rom 13:1–7, absent). The gospel that arrived from outside covenant history was given an Abrahamic genealogy (Gal 3:6–9, absent). The uncircumcised faith that had no Old Testament warrant was grounded in Abraham’s biography (Romans 4, absent). The election of Israel that Paul had left unresolved was answered by the olive-tree allegory (“all Israel shall be saved,” Romans 9–11, absent). Each of those passages was doing specific work. The antitheses in this companion are what that work was answering.

What the Editors Were Doing

The absent passages chapter makes the editorial logic visible. Romans 13:1–7 resolved the tension between Paul’s gospel and Old Testament political theology. Galatians 3:6–9 gave Paul’s grace a Jewish genealogy it did not have without it. Romans 4 provided the Old Testament warrant for faith over circumcision. Romans 9–11 answered the covenant question the authentic letters left open. Each insertion addressed a specific antithesis. The antitheses in this companion are what those insertions were answering.

The direction of every insertion is the same: toward the Old Testament, toward covenant continuity, toward institutional hierarchy, toward conditional relationship. No insertion moves Paul further from the Old Testament than he already was. The editorial programme did not add diversity; it added convergence. The convergence was with a specific source.

What Remains

The antitheses were not constructed by Marcion. They were not constructed by this companion. They are what the proto-Pauline text says with the later editorial inser-

tions set aside — the text Marcion received. A reader who disputes the interpolation evidence should engage Companion A. A reader who accepts it is reading the same letters Marcion read — and the antitheses were already there.

A Note on Acts and Paul's Biography

Acts portrays Paul circumcising Timothy (16:3), submitting to the Jerusalem council decree (15:28-29), and purifying himself in the Temple (21:24-26). Galatians 2:3-6 says Titus was not compelled to be circumcised and the pillar apostles imparted nothing to Paul. These are factual contradictions between two sources about the same person. This is a source-critical observation rather than a theological antithesis because the chronological relationship between Acts and Galatians (Paul predates Acts by approximately thirty years) means this is a question about what Luke knew or chose to depict, not a symmetric comparison of two contemporary theological positions.

A Note on the Household Codes in 1 Peter

1 Peter 2:13-17 (submit to governing authorities), 2:18 (servants obey masters), and 3:1 (wives submit to husbands) contain the institutional codes identified as interpolations in Paul's letters in this series. Their presence in a letter universally identified as pseudonymous by critical scholarship confirms these codes were the ambient theology of the proto-orthodox movement — not original Pauline teaching. The interpolators were not inventing a position. They were inserting the position that already appeared in the community's other documents. The Haustafel passages absent from Companion B (later inserted into canonical Paul) did not originate in Paul. They originated in the tradition that edited Paul.